# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**DAINGERFIELD-LONE STAR ISD** 

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	63%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	13%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report	Ū	
						residential facility.	11001 01		I	ı		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 58%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	45%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.59/	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi- means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_1

DAINGERFIELD-LONE STAR ISD

Region

172002

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District DALHART ISD

Region

County District No

16

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators et?  5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	70%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements  6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		1% 1% YES		YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	·	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	52%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 55%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3370		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	056901
otriot	DAI HART ISD	

strict DALHART IS

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 057

Region

10 057804

trict DALLAS CAN ACADEMY CHARTER

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	41%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	32%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early of special education services in the special education services are special education services and services education services ed	ar early iving the and related			Data Report	•	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			raigotorio	r roquirou roi	2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	30%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	13%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		1 1 2	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_05

DALLAS CAN ACADEMY CHARTER

Region

10 057804

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

DALLAS COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

County District No

Region

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early oprogram; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report	J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 50%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.570	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

DALLAS COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**DALLAS COUNTY JUVENILE JUSTICE** 

County District No

Region

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	11%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	100%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	86%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early oprogram; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report	J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 17%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 11%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.570	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

DALLAS COUNTY JUVENILE JUSTICE

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

one year of leaving high school.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **DALLAS ISD** 

Region

County District No

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual e Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	65%	NO	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	79%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	18%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoof facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Repor	·	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 54%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 52%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district I	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.576	140		125	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	U
D 41 1 4 0 10 D	

Region

District DALLAS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		NO
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DAMON ISD	

Region

County District No

04

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	83%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	6%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		rearly ring the and related hildhood cicial  Baseline Data Reporting Year hildhood Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 58%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 75%	Math NO	ath acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary		57%	58.7%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0.5%	NO		1 1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summ. Statemer		72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	020910
strict	DAMONISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DANBURY ISD

Region

County District No

04

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	85%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	7%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 60%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	lath acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary 57		57%	58.7%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.3%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	020904
District	DANBURY ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  56%		YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District DARROUZETT ISD

Region 16
County District No 148905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 83%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 83%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	, .	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invineans of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	DARROUZETT ISD

DARROUZETT ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	NO Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District \_\_\_ **DAWSON ISD** 

Region

County District No

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	66%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	18%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading 95%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
						residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	70%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills			58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	83%	59%	NO	67%		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES			72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	175904
District	DAWSON ISD	

Region

LEA LEA State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or. they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DAWSON ISD
District	DAWSON ISD

Region

County District No

17

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	88%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related  Baseline Data Reporting Year						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 60%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 20%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0.5%	INU		1 1 2			72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District 140	00000=
District	DAWSON ISD	
District	DAW30N 13D	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Met State Target?	
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO	YES	
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary in the time they left school.		57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

4A: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

*IEPs* 

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

10 days in a school year for children with

0%

0%

0.5%

0.7%

NO

NO

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DAYTON ISD

82.7%

73.1%

77%

YES

YES

YES

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

81%

72%

76%

04

146902

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 89% 68% 67% NO 64% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 4% 10% 13% NO 13% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 63% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 58% NO

7C: Percent of preschool

children aged 3 through 5

demonstrate improved use

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

with IEPs who

meet their needs

YES

YES

Summary

Statement 1

Summarv

Statement 2

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DAYTON ISD

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District DE LEON ISD

Region

County District No

14

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Durat	
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	64%	NO	demonstrate improved	- Ciatomoni 1					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 55%	Math acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary NO Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3070		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES			72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	04790
DE LEONIOD	

District DE LEON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DECATUR ISD

Region

County District No

11

249905

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 88% 68% 67% NO 73% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 9% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 59% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 49% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District N
District	DECATUR ISD

Region

Due to small

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES inappropriate identification of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in

secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time

71%

69%

NO

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

education or in some other postsecondary

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

100%

99.1%

NO

prior to age 3, who are found eligible for

Part B. and who have an IEP developed

and implemented by their third birthdays

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

YFS

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District \_\_\_ DEER PARK ISD

Region

County District No

04

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	77%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	76%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	10%	13%	NO	7%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
		3373		3373	0	education class, separate so residential facility.	cation class, separate school or dential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Stateme		79%	81.2%	YES Due to small			
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	60%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3.70		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs 0.5% NO	YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported					
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County	DISTRICT

District **DEER PARK ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DEKALB ISD
District	

80

019901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 88% 68% 67% NO 70% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 13% 10% 13% NO 6% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 93% NO education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 96% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 42% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 45% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No _	019901
DEKVI B ISD	

District DEKALB ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

10 days in a school year for children with

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

*IEPs* 

0%

0%

0.5%

0.7%

NO

NO

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DEL VALLE IS
District	DEL VALLE IS

13

227910

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 84% 68% 67% NO 66% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 7% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 11% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 52% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 54% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small

with IEPs who

meet their needs

demonstrate improved use

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

Summarv

Statement 2

72%

76%

73.1%

77%

YES

YES

YES

YES

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	C	O	uľ	ηt	y	L	)IS	τr	ICT	INC	)

District DEL VALLE ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **DELL CITY ISD**  19

115903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State **LEA** Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 0% 68% 67% NO 100% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 0% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 100% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math Math data are not reported Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 100% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

**DELL CITY ISD** District

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DENISON ISD	

Region

County District No

10

091903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	58%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	2%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.  Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 48%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	year for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summ	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported						
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	•	
District	DENISON ISD	

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DENTON ISD	

Region

County District No

11

061901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	80%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	1%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	11%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	majority of operation and related			Baseline Data Reporting Year argets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 62%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	ar for children with demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summa	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported						
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County Biothiot 140	00.00.
District	DENTON ISD	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

10 days in a school year of children with

IEPs by race and ethnicity

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **DENVER CITY ISD**  17

251901

data are not reported

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State **LEA** Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 92% 68% 67% NO 88% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 7% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 76% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 68% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 | ocal Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	2
District	DENVER CITY ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DESOTO ISD	

10

057906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 66% 68% 67% NO 55% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 7% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 56% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 57% YES 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 49% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 72% YES 73.1% Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	057906

Region

District DESOTO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DETROIT ISD	

80

194905

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 88% 68% 67% NO 53% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 13% 10% 13% NO 11% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 33% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 33% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	194905
	_	
District	DETROIT ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	s small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

**DEVERS ISD** District

Region County District No 146903

04

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	82%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report	•		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of						district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	83%	YES	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		01.1040.104	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	INO		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	of appropriate behaviors to Summa		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	140303
	· —	
District	DEVERS ISD	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DEVINE ISD	

20

163901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 88% 68% 67% NO 70% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 8% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 2% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 62% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 56% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	163901
DEV/INT 10D	

Region

20

District DEVINE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DEW ISD

12

081906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 60% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO 10% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 100% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math Math data are not reported Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 86% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	12
County District No	081906
· -	

District **DEW ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DEWEYVILLE IS
District	DEWETVILLE

05

176903

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	63%	NO		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0%	YES		
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education	lar early iving the and related	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	95%	99%	YES	96%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate so residential facility.	pecial							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math Children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1 79% 81.2% with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		79%	81.2%	YES		o small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported				
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 1  Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INU		1 1 1 1 1			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		of appropriate behaviors to Sum		72%	73.1%	YES
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported		

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District N
District	DEWEYVILLE ISD

Region **DEWEYVILLE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	163902
District	D'HANIS ISD	

Region

20

LEA State State **LEA Met** State **LEA** Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 75% 68% 67% NO 64% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 25% NO 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 0% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 38% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 35% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% YES 73.1% Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	10
District	D'HANIS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DIBOLL ISD

07

003905

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 93% 68% 67% NO 87% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 10% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 66% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 61% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	003905
<b>a</b> t	DIBOLLIED	

Region

District DIBOLL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DICKINSON ISD	

04

084901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 70% 68% 67% NO 71% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 16% 10% 13% NO 19% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital #NA objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 64% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 63% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	084901
District	DICKINSON ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

strict	DILL FY ISD	

20

082902

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 67% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 20% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 41% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 57% YES 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 43% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 72% YES 73.1% Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	

Region

District DILLEY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District DIME BOX ISD

Region

County District No

13

144903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	88%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s			Data Repor	·		
		0070	120	10070		education class, separate school or residential facility.		_				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	56%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 70	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2 57%		57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				30%		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0.5% NO	NO	NO	YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	144903
District	DIME BOX ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DIMMITT ISD	

16

035901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 66% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 9% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 67% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 56% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	035901
otriot	DIMMITT ISD	

District **DIMMITT ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 | ocal Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DIVIDE ISD	

20

133905

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO #NA #NA 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO #NA #NA than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital #NA #NA objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES #NA #NA education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YFS #NA #NA skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO #NA #NA demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math Math data are not reported Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO #NA #NA 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	1
	_	
.* - 1		

Region

District DIVIDE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DODD CITY ISD

10

074904

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 71% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 10% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 90% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 45% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County Diotnot No	٠.
District	DODD CITY ISD	
District	DODD CITY ISD	

Region

County District No.

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or. they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DONNA ISD	

Region

County District No

01

108902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	68%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	79%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	17%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	14%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	isition and use of		YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	demonstrate improved use of appropriate hehaviors to Sum	of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported			
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	108902
)istrict	DONNA ISD	
NSTRICT	DONNAISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

DOSS CONSOLIDATED CSD

Region 13 County District No 086024

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	0%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	50%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C</b> : Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special  with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program; and required for FFY and the services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				•	
	3070	0070	120	10070	120								
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	F70/	EQ 70/	YES	,	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	50%	NO	3.4.2.2	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	140		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District DC

County District No \_\_\_\_

DOSS CONSOLIDATED CSD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DOUGLASS ISD

07

174911

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 67% 68% 67% NO 62% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 6% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 71% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 71% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

trict	DOUGLASS ISD	

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

DR M L GARZA-GONZALEZ CHARTER SCHO District

Region 02 County District No 178801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	45%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	45%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early oprogram; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
						residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070			small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3370		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 178801

DR M L GARZA-GONZALEZ CHARTER SCHO

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

IEPs by race and ethnicity

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DRAW ACADEMY

04

101856

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 91% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 71% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 71% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported

for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	

District DRAW ACADEMY

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	<b>DRIPPING SPRINGS ISD</b>
Diotriot	

Region 13 County District No 105904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	74%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Reporting \( \)						
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES			raigoto not required for the			1 FF 1 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported			
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES				
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 82%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary					district level ot reported		
	83%	59%	NO	87%	YES	Wiowicage and skins	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES				
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		VEQ	YES  7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%	INO		1 E S			72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES			77%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported				

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	•	
strict	DRIPPING SPRINGS IS	D

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District DRISCOLL ISD

Region

County District No

02

178905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	53%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si	lar early iving the and related childhood	Baseline Data Reporting Year				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	64%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 73%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				1376		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _
District	DRISCOLL ISD

Region

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES inappropriate identification of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DUBLIN ISD	

Region

County District No

11

072902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	78%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	16%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 73%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 58%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 70	0.3%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	072902
int.	DUBLINIED	

District DUBLIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	16
County District No	171901
•	

District **DUMAS ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	89%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	75%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seeducation class, separate se	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1 79% with IEPs who		81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 59%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.576	NO		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	171901
listrict	DIIMAS ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

10 days in a school year for children with

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

*IEPs* 

0%

0%

0.5%

0.7%

NO

NO

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	DUNCANVILLE I

10

057907

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 67% 68% 67% NO 59% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 19% 10% 13% NO 15% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 65% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 52% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5

with IEPs who

meet their needs

demonstrate improved use

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

YES

YES

Statement 1

Summarv

Statement 2

72%

76%

73.1%

77%

YES

YES

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

		C	0	u	n	ty	' L	JIS	sti	ric	t	N	0

District **DUNCANVILLE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

Region 11
County District No 220918

District EAGLE MT-SAGINAW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	82%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or					•	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small		
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 76%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 68%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported		

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region 11 County District No 220918

**EAGLE MT-SAGINAW ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ОМ	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **EAGLE PASS ISD** 

Region 20 County District No 159901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	15%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	16%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	education class, separate school or residential facility.							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 63%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary			\/=0	,	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	68%	NO	Wiewiedge and ekine	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES			
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 70	0.3%	INO		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	EAGLE PASS ISD

Region

level data are not

reported

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EANES ISD	

13

227909

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 77% 68% 67% NO 60% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 5% 10% 13% NO 15% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 98% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 87% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math Math data are not reported Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 89% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% YES 73.1% Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No _	227909
 EANES IOD	

District EANES ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	15
County District No	025909
•	

EARLY ISD District \_\_\_

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	67%	NO	through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	17%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special  with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood Baseline Data Reporting Ye.  Targets not required for FFY 2					J	
						residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool	,							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES				
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	74%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 78%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District NO	023909
strict	FARLY ISD	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

ict	rict	

Region County District No

03 241902

**EAST BERNARD ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	54%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education	lar early iving the and related		Baseline Data Reporting Year				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.	pecial		r FFY 2011	FY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 83%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	570/	50.70/	VEO	,	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	71%	NO	3	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.576	140		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2  72%  73.1%  YES		numbers, district level data are not reported					
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County	District	No

District **EAST BERNARD ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

**EAST CENTRAL ISD** District

Region County District No 015911

20

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	84%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	63%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early	lar early iving the and related childhood		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	59%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No 015911

District EAST CENTRAL ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EAST CHAMBERS IS
DISTRICT	EAST CHAMBERS IS

05

036903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 49% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 13% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 62% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 45% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No

District **EAST CHAMBERS ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District EAST FORT WORTH MONTESSORI ACADEMY

Region

County District No

11

220811

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 100% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 50% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 81% 82.7% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

FACT FORT WORTH MONTES

Region 11
County District No 220811

District EAST FORT WORTH MONTESSORI ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**EAST TEXAS CHARTER SCHOOLS** 

County District No

Region

07

092801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	91%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES			
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES			
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES			
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	with IEPs attending (a) regul- childhood program and recei- majority of special education services in the regular early - program; and (b) separate sp	Percent of children aged 3 through 5 n IEPs attending (a) regular early dhood program and receiving the iority of special education and related vices in the regular early childhood gram; and (b) separate special location class, separate school or			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
						residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool									
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 33%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported				
	83%	59%	NO	33%	NO	knowledge and Skills									
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0.5	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level			
		0.5 /6				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported			

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_09
EAST TEXAS CHARTER SCHOOLS

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EASTLAND ISD	

14

067903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 64% 68% 67% NO 64% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 29% NO 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 10% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 95% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 95% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 79% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 71% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	0

District EASTLAND ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56% 57% YES		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	ECTOR COUNTY ISD

18

068901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 63% 68% 67% NO 71% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 26% NO 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 13% NO than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 98% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 98% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 51% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 45% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District ECTOR COUNTY ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  156%  157%  YES		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	ECTOR ISD	

Region

County District No

10

074905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	59%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 62%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 70	0.3%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	0749
 EGTOD IOD	

District ECTOR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  156%  157%  YES		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EDCOUCH-ELSA ISE

Region

County District No

01

108903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	79%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	60%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	13%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	24%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 52%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 70	0.3%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District **EDCOUCH-ELSA ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EDEN CISD	

15

048901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 78% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 6% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 92% NO education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 92% NO skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 73% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 73% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District 140	0.000.
District	EDEN CISD	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Jin4	rict	

**EDEN PARK ACADEMY** 

County District No

Region

13 227803

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	82%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ending (a) regular early ogram and receiving the opecial education and related be regular early childhood of (b) separate special sss, separate school or						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.  Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 56%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 44%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		VEQ	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	par for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate helpaviors to Summa	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported						
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No 227803

District EDEN PARK ACADEMY

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	234903

Region

District **EDGEWOOD ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	88%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	62%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	5%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	4%	NO	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate so	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
						residential facility.							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	62%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1		33.370	120		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 46%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	nd use of		YES	data are n	ot reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				1070		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	23490
etrict	EDGEWOOD ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

strict	EDGEWOOD ISD

20

015905

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 78% 68% 67% NO 77% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 14% 10% 13% NO 13% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 53% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 57% YES 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 46% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 72% YES 73.1% Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

10: Percent of districts with

categories that is the result of

inappropriate identification

11: Percent of children who were

disproportionate representation of racial

and ethnic groups in specific disability

evaluated within 60 days of receiving

if the State establishes a timeframe

within which the evaluation must be

conducted, within that timeframe

parental consent for initial evaluation or,

12: Percent of children referred by Part C

prior to age 3, who are found eligible for

Part B. and who have an IEP developed

and implemented by their third birthdays

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	EDGEWOOD ISD

24%

56%

71%

22%

57%

69%

NO

YES

NO

Region

Due to small

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

Due to small

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

Due to small

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES inappropriate identification of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs

14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

education or in some other postsecondary

one year of leaving high school.

vear of leaving high school

secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time

education within one year of leaving high school.

secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time

education or competitively employed within one

secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

0%

100%

100%

0%

98.8%

99.1%

YES

NO

NO

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

YES

NO

YFS

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EDINBURG CISD
District	

Region

County District No

01

108904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	76%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	16%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 98%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.  Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 65%	Math NO	Math acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary		57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County	District	N

District EDINBURG CISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	120901
<b>^+</b>	EDNA ISD	

Region

03

District \_\_ EDNA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	83%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool				Data Repor	J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	51%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 51%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.50/	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INU		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	120901	
Nintriot	EDMA ISD		

Region

District EDNA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EDUCATION CENTER

Region

County District No

11

061802

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 90% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 0% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 63% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 40% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	EDUCATION CENTER

Region 11 nty District No 061802

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		NO
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) Region 10
County District No 057833

District EDUCATION CENTER INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	50%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 20 <sup>2</sup>		J		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 33%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 44%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills  Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	, .	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.576	140		1123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No \_\_\_

10 057833

District EDUCATION CENTER INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EHRHART SCHOO

05

123805

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 100% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 45% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 36% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District EHRHART SCHOOL

Region 05
County District No 123805

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EL CAMPO ISD

03

241903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 92% 68% 67% NO 68% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 4% 10% 13% NO 18% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 65% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 61% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No _

Region

District EL CAMPO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **EL PASO ACADEMY** 

Region 19 County District No 071804

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	33%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	42%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 201			•		
	95%	99%	YES	89%	NO	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			rargets no	it required for			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 63%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of	Cummon				,	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	25%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES			
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	, .	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District EL PASO ACADEMY

Region 19 County District No 071804

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **EL PASO ISD** 

Region County District No 071902

19

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	68%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	73%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Ye Targets not required for FFY 2		·		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 64%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	NO		113	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	071902

District EL PASO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **ELECTRA ISD** 

Region

County District No

09

243902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 97%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math Math Math Math Math Math Summary  Math Math Math Math Math Math Math Summary  Statement 1		Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small					
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 44%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 44%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Stateme		57%	58.7%	YES	, .	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	dren with 0,0 0.370 NO demonstrate improved use of appropriate helpaviors to Sun	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported						
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	2439
District	ELECTRA ISD	

Region

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or. they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher

education or in some other postsecondary

one year of leaving high school.

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

71%

69%

NO

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

100%

99.1%

NO

and implemented by their third birthdays

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

YFS

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	011902
51 0W 105	

Region

District **ELGIN ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	70%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	10%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 98%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math Math Math Math Math Summary Statement of Summa		Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small					
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 58%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statemen		57%	58.7%	YES	, .	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	th 0.5% 0.5% NO leading to demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Sumr	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported						
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	13
County District No	011902

District ELGIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	dary school, had IEPs in effect at the time ift school, and were enrolled in higher tion or competitively employed within one  56%  57%  YES		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	ELKHART ISD

07

001903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 56% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 21% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 56% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 58% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District NO _	001903
	_	
istrict	FI KHART ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District \_\_

County District No

Region

07

102906

ct ELYSIAN FIELDS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	53%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	2%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate se	lar early iving the a and related childhood pecial		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	59%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 78	00.076	123		o small district level	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	54%	NO		Staternent 2						
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District ELYSIAN FIELDS ISD

Region 07
County District No 102906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	ENNIS ISD	

10

070903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 89% 68% 67% NO 59% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 2% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 11% NO than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 59% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 54% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 81% 82.7% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District NO _	070903
District	ENNIS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	11
County District No	049906

District ERA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	60%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading Readin					ŭ					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES		education class, separate school or						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	80%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1		30.070			o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 73%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported	
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	ays in a school year for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	YES numbers, dist						
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	049906
<b>a</b> t	EDAJED	

District ERA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**ERATH EXCELS ACADEMY INC** 

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	56%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	88%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	11%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				•	a Reporting Year quired for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	79%	81.2%	YES		Due to small numbers, district level			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 20%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary			\/=0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported		
	83%	59%	NO	0%	NO	Wiewiedge and Skins	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES				
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 70	0.3%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported		

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_\_
ERATH EXCELS ACADEMY INC

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

istrict	FTOILF ISD	

07

174910

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 71% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO 24% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 50% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 40% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 72% YES 73.1% Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District NO _	174910
	· —	
District	FTOILF ISD	

Region

County District No

LEA LEA State State Performance Plan/ Annual State LEA Met LEA State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or. they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district education or in some other postsecondary and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	030906
District	EULA ISD	

Region

14

LEA State State **LEA Met** State **LEA** Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 70% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 9% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 55% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

rtogion	17
County District No	030906

District EULA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

**EUSTACE ISD** District

Region County District No 107905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES		<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	61%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
									I	1			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small	
		63% Math	NO	69%	NO Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported	
	Math 83%	59%	Math NO	Math 56%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	uala ale li	ot reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	201	0.50/	No		\/F0	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported					
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	1
 EUGT 4 GE 10D	

Region

District EUSTACE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **EVADALE ISD** 

Region County District No 121906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES		<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	87%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES									
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	_					district level ot reported		
	83%	59%	NO	56%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES				
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		150	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	76%	77%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev data are not reporte			

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District	ľ

District **EVADALE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	,	-
District	EVANT ISD	

County District No

Region

12

050901

LEA State State **LEA Met** State **LEA** Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 95% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 0% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 92% NO education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 55% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 58% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	050901
	_	
District	FVANT ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EVERMAN ISD

Region

County District No

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	77%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	72%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	18%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seeducation class, separat	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who  Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 55%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 52%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		NO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statement 1 statement 1 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	INO		INO			72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		NO	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	220904
	_	
Dietrict	EVERMAN ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**EVINS REGIONAL JUVENILE CENTER** 

County District No

Region

01

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		#NA	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	program; and (b) separate specture and control of the second of the seco	pecial		raigets not required for FF7 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math #NA	Math #NA	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

ct EVINS REGIONAL JUVENILE CENTER

108917

Region

County District No

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**EVOLUTION ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL** 

County District No

Region

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	53%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	96%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	17%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 121, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 80%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate so residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report t required for	orting Year for FFY 2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 25%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 11%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 78	0.376	140		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**EVOLUTION ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL** 

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

04 101811

District

**EXCEL ACADEMY** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	94%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	100%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	6%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				eline Data Reporting Year s not required for FFY 2011		
		2275				education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 2%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	_				,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	2%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.59/	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District	NO

District **EXCEL ACADEMY** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EXCELSIOR ISD

07

210906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 90% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO 7% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 53% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 53% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	210906
istrict	EXCELSIOR ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	EZZELL ISD

03

143906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 57% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 80% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 40% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	143906
	· —	
Nietrict	F77FLL ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FABENS ISD	

Region

County District No

19

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	92%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 61%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	INO		IES			72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district I data are not repo	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inveneans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	071903

Region

19

District FABENS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District FAIRFIELD ISD

Region

County District No

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	96%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	80%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate se	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES		Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO		Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	, .	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	han 0% 0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district ladata are not report		
	0 /0	0.3% INO		123		Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES			
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	081902		
otriot	EVIBEIEI DIED			

District FAIRFIELD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

FAITH FAMILY ACADEMY OF OAK CLIFF

County District No

Region

10

057815

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	78%	YES			
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	1%	YES			
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES				
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early			Data Repor	·					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate specture and class, separate scresidential facility.	education class, separate school or residential facility.			education class, separate school or residential facility.					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 42%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported			
	83%	59%	NO	23%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		·			
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level			
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported			

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No <u>0578</u>:
FAITH FAMILY ACADEMY OF OAK CLIFF

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

**FALLS CITY ISD** District

Region County District No 128904

20

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	82%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements  6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regul- childhood program and recei- majority of special education services in the regular early- program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc			Data Report	Ū				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 94%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district le data are not repor			
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statement 1 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	NO		113	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summ		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County	District	N

District **FALLS CITY ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FANNINDEL ISD	

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	52%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early			Data Repor	J		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.		r FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 28%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 17%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool Summary children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	NO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement:		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County Diothot 110	0000
FANNINDEL ISD	
	FANNINDEL ISD

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No 043904 District **FARMERSVILLE ISD** 

Region

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	57%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	75%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate so			Data Report	J		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 68%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 63%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.5%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

		C	0	ur	ıτy	L	'IS	tric	CT	N

District **FARMERSVILLE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school in the secondary sch		YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FARWELL ISD	

Region

County District No

16

185902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	79%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 60%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	185902
istrict	FARWELL ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

**FAYETTEVILLE ISD** District

Region 13 County District No 075906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	0070	0070	. 20	10070	120							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 78%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	56%	NO	Miowedge and skills	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	, ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inveneans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District N

District **FAYETTEVILLE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

ict	EEDDIS ISD	

Region

County District No

10

070905

District \_\_\_\_\_ FERRIS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	54%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
									1			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%			to small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	61%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%				YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		1 1 1 2	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	10
County District No	070905

District FERRIS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

4A: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

*IEPs* 

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

10 days in a school year for children with

0%

0%

0.5%

0.7%

NO

NO

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FLATONIA ISD

82.7%

73.1%

77%

YES

YES

YES

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

81%

72%

76%

13

075901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 75% 68% 67% NO 62% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 13% 10% 13% NO 11% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 15% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 46% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 38% NO

7C: Percent of preschool

children aged 3 through 5

demonstrate improved use

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

with IEPs who

meet their needs

YES

YES

Summary

Statement 1

Summarv

Statement 2

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District 140	0.000.	
District	FLATONIA ISD		
DISTRICT	FLATONIA 13D		

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

strict	FLORENCE
SUIG	FLOKENCE

Dist ISD

Region County District No

13

246902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	58%	NO			
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES			
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO			
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading 98%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	·				
										1					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	71%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	3070	00.070	120		o small district level			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	54%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool	Cummon								
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEC	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small			
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0.5%	0% 0.5%	0% 0.5%	0% 0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported			

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	2469
 EL ODENCE ICO	

District FLORENCE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

FLORESVILLE ISD District

Region 20 County District No 247901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	82%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	12%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate so residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report	Ū	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 56%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	-	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	NO		ILS	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	, ·	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District	ľ

District **FLORESVILLE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

significant discrepancy in the rate of

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

*IEPs* 

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

10 days in a school year for children with

0%

0%

0.5%

0.7%

NO

NO

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

D:	EL QUED DI LIEE 101
District	FLOUR BLUFF ISI

82.7%

73.1%

77%

YES

YES

YES

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

81%

72%

76%

02

178914

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 88% 68% 67% NO 75% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 3% 10% 13% NO 12% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 64% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 62% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool

children aged 3 through 5

demonstrate improved use

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

with IEPs who

meet their needs

YES

YES

Summary

Statement 1

Summarv

Statement 2

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	FLOUR BLUFF ISD

Region

reported

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES inappropriate identification of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FLOYDADA ISD

17

077901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 47% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 4% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 50% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 36% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

		011001
	·	
istrict	EI OYDADA ISD	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

**FOCUS LEARNING ACADEMY** District

Region

County District No

10

057817

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	99%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading Readin						J					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate so residential facility.		Targets no	t required for	IUI FFY ZUTT				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES		o small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 27%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 14%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INU		1 1 1 1 1	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region \_ County District No

057817

rict FOCUS LEARNING ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 148902

16

District

**FOLLETT ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	80%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.			T	T .	T	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 71%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	equisition and use of sowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				17,0		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No _	14890
 FOLLETT ICD	

District FOLLETT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

· · ·	
District	FORESTBURG ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 89% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 6% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 64% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 42% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

09 Region County District No 169910

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County Dioting		
District FORESTBURG I	SD	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FORNEY ISD	

10

129902

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 87% YES 75% 77% YES 68% 67% NO 68% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 16% NO than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 80% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 75% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	129902

Region

10

District FORNEY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

95%

Reading

87%

Math

83%

0%

0%

3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs

4A: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

10 days in a school year for children with

achievement standards

*IEPs* 

against grade level, modified, and alternate

99%

Reading

63%

Math

59%

0.5%

0.7%

YES

Reading

NO

Math

NO

NO

NO

100%

Reading

86%

Math

65%

YFS

Reading

NO

Math

NO

YES

YES

skills (including social

7B: Percent of preschool

demonstrate improved

acquisition and use of

7C: Percent of preschool

children aged 3 through 5

demonstrate improved use

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

knowledge and skills

children aged 3 through 5

relationships)

with IEPs who

with IEPs who

meet their needs

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FORSAN ISD

18

114904

Region

County District No

YES

YES

YES

YES

YES

YES

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 86% 68% 67% NO 91% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 14% 10% 13% NO 6% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported

Summarv

Statement 2

Summarv

Statement 1

Summary

Statement 2

Summary

Statement 1

Summarv

Statement 2

61%

80%

57%

81%

72%

76%

62.1%

80.8%

58.7%

82.7%

73.1%

77%

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	114904
L	FORCANICD	

Region

18

District FORSAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	04
County District No	079907

District FORT BEND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	71%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	48%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	23%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool	Summary					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	78%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	83%	59%	NO	72%	NO	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
suspensions and expulsions of greater trian 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	a school year for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate helpaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported					
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	,	
District	FORT BEND ISD	

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FORT ELLIOTT CISD
District	I OIL ELLIOTT GIOD

Region 16 County District No 242906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	73%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report	Ū	
	3070	0070	120	10070	120	education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 47%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	570/	50.70/	\/F0	,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	41%	NO	nnomouge and online	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.376	140		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District FORT ELLIOTT CISD

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FORT STOCKTON ISD

Region

County District No

18

186902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	77%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	15%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	·	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 74%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U70	0.5%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	FORT STOCKTON IS

FORT STOCKTON ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

FORT WORTH ACADEMY OF FINE ARTS

County District No

Region

11

220809

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early oprogram; and (b) separate speducation class, separate so	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 83%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.076	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

FORT WORTH ACADEMY OF FINE ARTS

Region 11
County District No 220809

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County Distric

Region 11 County District No 220804

District

FORT WORTH CAN ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	24%	NO	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	55%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related			Data Repor	Ü	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Targets no	t required for	FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 44%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	32%	NO		Statement 2	07 70	00.1 70	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region \_ County District No

FORT WORTH CAN ACADEMY

220804

strict

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FORT WORTH ISD

Region

County District No

11

220905

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 68% 68% 67% NO 75% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 22% NO 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 14% NO than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 3% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 59% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 54% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	

District FORT WORTH ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FRANKLIN ISD

06

198903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 92% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 3% YFS than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 88% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 76% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

		.0000
	_	
District	FRANKLIN ISD	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FRANKSTON ISD

07

001904

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	55%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)  Summary Statement 2		61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 53%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 40%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2			YES		ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 81%		82.7%	YES		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U70	0.5%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		appropriate behaviors to Summary 72% 73.1%		YES	numbers, district data are not rep		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	0019
etrict	ED VNKSTON ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FREDERICKSBURG IS

13

086901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 89% 68% 67% NO 60% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 5% 10% 13% NO 13% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 61% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 62% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FREDERICKSBURG ISD

Region

Due to small

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

County District No.

LEA LEA State State LEA Met State Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or. they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe

14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

education or in some other postsecondary

one year of leaving high school.

secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time

71%

69%

NO

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

100%

99.1%

NO

12: Percent of children referred by Part C

prior to age 3, who are found eligible for

Part B. and who have an IEP developed

and implemented by their third birthdays

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

YFS

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FREER ISD	

02

066903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 90% 68% 67% NO 82% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 10% 10% 13% NO 4% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 60% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 71% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No _	066903

Region

District FREER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in 56% secondary school 55% year of leaving high school		numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FRENSHIP ISD	

Region

County District No

17

152907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	87%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seeducation class, separate segmental facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 80%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 72%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	INO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported				
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District 140	.0200.
	_	
District	FRENSHIP ISD	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FRIENDSWOOD ISD
District	I KILINDONIOOD IOD

Region

County District No

04

084911

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	3%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	#NA	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate syeducation class, separate so	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
						residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	85%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 81%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%			data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported					
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

D:	County District No _	08
District	FRIENDSWOOD ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES			numbers	o small s, district a are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	16
County District No	185903

FRIONA ISD District \_\_\_\_

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	66%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	2%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
					_							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	75%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	60%	60.6%	TES		small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	data are not re		
	83%	59%	NO	69%	NO		Staternent 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		VES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	school year for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate helpaviors to Summa.	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported					
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	185903
lictrict	EDIONA ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

0%

0.7%

NO

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	043905

FRISCO ISD

District

77%

76%

YES

numbers, district level

data are not reported

LEA State State **LEA Met** State **LEA** Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 93% 68% 67% NO 75% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 2% 10% 13% NO 7% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 0% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 89% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 88% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small

YES

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	043905
•	

Region

10

District FRISCO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FROST ISD	

12

175905

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 100% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 50% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 55% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 81% 82.7% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	175905
	-	
)istrict	FROST ISD	

Region

Di

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  56%		57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District FRUITVALE ISD

Region

County District No

07

234909

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	59%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	10%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s	lar early iving the a and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
		3370		10070		education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	62%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 70	00.076	123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	equisition and use of sowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	48%	NO		Glatement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		\/F0	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 1  Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES			72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FRUITVALE ISD	

Region

County District No.

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or. they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FT DAVIS ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 85% 68% 67% NO 92% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 2% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 74% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 52% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

18 Region County District No 122901

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	122901
	·	
District	FT DAVIS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		NO		YES	
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

IEPs by race and ethnicity

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	FT HANCOCK ISE

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 50% 68% 67% NO 94% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 25% NO 0% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 6% "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 27% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 18% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported

for children with disabilities

19 Region 115901 County District No

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	
1		

District FT HANCOCK ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Target?		LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

FT SAM HOUSTON ISD District

Region 20 County District No 015914

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	67%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	73%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	4%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early			Baseline Data Reporting Year argets not required for FFY 2011			
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)  Summary Statement 2		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	65%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement				Due to sma numbers, district	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 58%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement:		57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	e improved use te behaviors to Summary 72% 73.1% YES	YES		ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	Recet their needs      Statement 2      Statement 2		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County	District	NC

Region 20 ntv District No 015914

District FT SAM HOUSTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District \_\_\_\_ **GAINESVILLE ISD** 

Region

County District No

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	96%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	50%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	95%	99%	163	99%	123	education class, separate so residential facility.	ducation class, separate school or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	54%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	OU /6	00.076	123		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 55%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than					YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District GAINESVILLE ISD

Region 11
County District No 049901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**GAINESVILLE STATE SCHOOL** 

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		#NA	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early	lar early iving the and related	Baseline Data Reporting Year				
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math #NA	Math #NA	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	1			o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

GAINESVILLE STATE SCHOOL

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GALENA PARK ISD

Region 04 County District No 101910

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	83%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early	ar early iving the and related childhood	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate specture and class, separate scresidential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 61%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	_				,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	61%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District N
District	GALENA PARK ISE

**GALENA PARK ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GALVESTON ISD
District	GALVESTONISD

County District No 084902

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	70%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	58%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	26%	NO	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	20%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	#NA	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate so			Data Repor	·		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5		79%	81.2%	YES		
	iviatii	Maur	iviatii	iviaui	Iviatii	with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Statement 1	7 9 70	01.270	123		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	222/	00.00/	\/F0		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	58%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	57%	NO		Statement 2	37 70	30.1 70	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.570	140			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	
District	GALVESTON ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

DISTRICT GANADO ISD	District	GANADO ISD
---------------------	----------	------------

03

120902

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 83% 68% 67% NO 65% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 17% NO 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 2% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 94% NO education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 94% NO skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 66% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 52% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	120902
CANADO ICO	

Region

District GANADO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	YES  14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	CARLAND IST
District	GARLAND ISD

10

057909

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 80% 68% 67% NO 65% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 6% 10% 13% NO 11% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 69% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 64% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No <u>057909</u>
District GARLAND ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		NO
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GARNER ISD	

Region

County District No

11

184911

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 67% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO 27% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 58% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 33% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	104311
District	GARNER ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GARRISON ISD

07

174903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 86% 68% 67% NO 82% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 16% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 50% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 58% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	20 a, 2.0	
	· —	
District	GARRISON ISD	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES  14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	07
County District No	183904

District \_\_\_\_ **GARY ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	79%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		Baseline Data Reporti Targets not required for			•	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 69%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 56%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement		57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	183904							
0.4.0.V.10.0									

Region

District GARY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **GATESVILLE ISD** 

Region

County District No

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	87%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	3%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	12%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES				raigets no				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are not repor		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	000/	00.00/	VEC			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	61%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	51%	NO		Statement 2						
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	ue to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level not reported	

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	GATESVILLE ISD

**GATESVILLE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region 01
County District No 240801

strict GAT

GATEWAY (S	STUDENT ALTERNATIVE PROGR
------------	---------------------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	89%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	97%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	3%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	·	
		3370		3373								
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	_	
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	18%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District GATEWAY (STUDENT ALTERNATIVE PROGR

Region 01
County District No 240801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**GATEWAY CHARTER ACADEMY** 

County District No

Region

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	80%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	43%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or			Baseline Data Repo Targets not required fo		J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 69%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs						demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement:		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_\_(
GATEWAY CHARTER ACADEMY

Region

10 057831

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GAUSE ISD

06

166902

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 91% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 89% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 89% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County Distric	t No	166902

Region

District GAUSE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to smal numbers, distr level data are reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	<b>GEORGE GERVIN ACADEMY</b>
District	CLONGE CENTIN ACADEMI

Region 20 County District No 015802

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	75%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	100%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the				with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Reporting					
	95%	99%	YES	94%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			rargets no	t requirea foi	r FFY 2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	47%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		small district level	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	53%	NO		Statement 2						
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		V50	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

015802

rict GEORGE GERVIN ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**GEORGE I SANCHEZ CHARTER** 

Region

County District No

04

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	83%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	98%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	17%	NO	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	2%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	95%	99%	YES	96%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 27%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	9%	NO		Statement 2	57%	36.7%	TES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	370	0.070	140			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES data are no		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

**GEORGE I SANCHEZ CHARTER** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State State State Met Target Rate Target?			LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GEORGE WEST ISD

02

149901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 55% 68% 67% NO 65% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 27% NO 8% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 100% 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 97% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 97% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 74% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 58% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District N

District **GEORGE WEST ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State State State Met Target?			LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, dis level data are reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **GEORGETOWN ISD** 

Region

County District No

13

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	68%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 201			·	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 69%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8% YES			o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 65%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1				o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.576	NO		ILS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1% YES		numbers, district le data are not report	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	(	0ر	u	пц	L	7IS	ś٤	110	Jι	IN

District **GEORGETOWN ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **GHOLSON ISD** 

Region County District No 161925

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	69%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 92%	Reading NO	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district data are not rep	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
	U 76	0.3%	NO		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County	District N	1

District **GHOLSON ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GIDDINGS ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 73% 68% 67% NO 74% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 7% YES 8% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 62% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 57% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Region 13
County District No 144901

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GIDDINGS ISD

Region

144901

County District No.

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or. they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**GIDDINGS STATE SCHOOL** 

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		#NA	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related  Baseline Data Reporting Year						
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate so residential facility.		Targets no	t required for	r FFY 2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math #NA	Math #NA	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0.5%	INO		1 5	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No

**GIDDINGS STATE SCHOOL** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, dist level data are reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	OIL MED ICD
District	GILMER ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 61% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 17% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 100% 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 98% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 66% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 55% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

07 Region 230902 County District No

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District NO _	230902
District	GILMER ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to smooth numbers, dis level data are reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

**GIRLS & BOYS PREPARATORY ACADEMY** District

Region

County District No

04

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	58%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 45%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 36%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.576	140		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_\_\_10180
GIRLS & BOYS PREPARATORY ACADEMY

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, dist level data are reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**GLADEWATER ISD** 

County District No

Region

07

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	78%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	37%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	20%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	16%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	lar early iving the a and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 41%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 41%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.576	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	GLADEWATER ISD

**GLADEWATER ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs			YES		
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are r reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Dic	trict	

**GLASSCOCK COUNTY ISD** 

County District No 087901

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	95%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special  with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood Baseline Data Report Targets not required for				•	·	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79% 81.2% YES		Due to small				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 78%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	NO		113	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, distr data are not r			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	tho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District GLASSCOCK COUNTY ISD

Region 18
County District No 087901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GLEN ROSE IS
District	GLLIN INOGL IG

Region

County District No

11

213901

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 82% 68% 67% NO 75% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 17% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 66% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 58% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	(	CO	ur	ηty	/ L	JIS	tri	CŢ	INC

District **GLEN ROSE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GODLEY ISD

Region

County District No

11

126911

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 93% 68% 67% NO 69% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 8% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 52% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 51% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	126911
iat	CODI EVIED	

District GODLEY ISI

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **GOLD BURG ISD** 

Region County District No 169906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	82%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	3070	3370	120	10070	120	education class, separate sc residential facility.	hool or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 40%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	570/	50.70/	VE0.	,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO		Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.576	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi- means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
District	GOLD BURG ISD

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

**GOLDEN RULE CHARTER SCHOOL** 

Region 10 County District No 057835

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial					
	93 76	9970	ILS	100 %	11.3	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 50%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				· ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	43%	NO	Knowledge and skins	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	INO		1 E S	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_\_057
GOLDEN RULE CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100% 99.3% NO		NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	s in effect at the time nrolled in higher 24% 22% NO		NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 12 County District No 167901

**GOLDTHWAITE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	68%	67%	NO	76%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s	lar early iving the a and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	·	
	95%	99%	163	100%	153	education class, separate so residential facility.	ucation class, separate school or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	63%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	59%	NO	7C. Developt of procedural						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		VE0	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who			82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	special education services w schools facilitated parent inv	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results		77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _
District	GOLDTHWAITE ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GOLIAD ISD	

Region

County District No

03

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	68%	67%	NO	77%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	10%	13%	NO	2%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.			e Data Repor	ŭ		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	A: Percent of preschool hildren aged 3 through 5		81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 58%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 47%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 1  Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	NO		ILS			72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District NO _	000302
District	GOLIAD ISD	
DISHICI	GULIAD ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GONZALES ISD

13

089901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 94% 68% 67% NO 49% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 16% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 48% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 52% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	C	C	ur	ηt	y	D	'IS	tri	Cī	INC

District GONZALES ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GOODRICH ISD
District	GOODINICHISD

06

187903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 79% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 11% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 5% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 44% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 44% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	187903
District	GOODRICH ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Dietrict	GOOSE CREEK CISE
District	GOOSE CREEK CISE

Region

County District No

04

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	71%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	69%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	12%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	14%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early	g (a) regular early n and receiving the education and related Baseline Data Reporting Year						
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate si education class, separate so residential facility.	pecial	Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		demonstrate improved use		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary 72%		73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District N

Region O4 10191

District GOOSE CREEK CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GORDON ISD	

Region

County District No

11

182901

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 83% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 0% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 89% NO education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 89% NO skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 88% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 75% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	11
County District No	182901
·	

District GORDON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GORMAN ISD	

Region

County District No

14

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate so	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1  residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 60%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 47%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement		57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.3%	INO		IES		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	001304
District	GORMAN ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	156905
CDADY ICD	

Region

18

District **GRADY ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	78%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.	education class, separate school or residential facility.					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	71%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	60.6%	Due t	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	86%	YES		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES		Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%			o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summar	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	numbers, district level data are not reported				
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	156905
intriot	CRADVIED	

strict GRADY IS

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **GRAFORD ISD** 

Region

County District No

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	4%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	150	100%	162							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are not reported	
<b>3C</b> : Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	71%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1		00.070			small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 71%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.50/	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District **GRAFORD ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Met Rate State Target?	
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GRAHAM ISI

09

252901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 90% 68% 67% NO 78% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 7% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 97% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 58% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 49% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No _	252901
 CDAHAMISD	

District GRAHAM ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **GRANBURY ISD** 

Region

County District No

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	78%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	77%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	TES	100%	165							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	53%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	163		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3470		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	111901
intrint	CDANBURYICD	

District GRANBURY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GRAND PRAIRIE ISD

Region 10 County District No 057910

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	68%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	74%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	17%	NO	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES				ŭ				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level		
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 56%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	_				,	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	56%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		,	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0.5%	INU		152	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	GRAND PRAIRIE ISD

Region 10
County District No 057910

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		NO
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GRAND SALINE
District	GIVAIND SALINE

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 56% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 11% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO YES 1% 1% YES 9% "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 98% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 52% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 45% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

07 Region 234904 County District No

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	•	ار	oui	щ	/ L	אוכ	LIII	Cl	INC

District **GRAND SALINE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

GRANDFALLS-ROYALTY ISD

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	73%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	pecial		l argets no	t required foi	FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 50%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 40%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district le data are not repor	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No

**GRANDFALLS-ROYALTY ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

0%

0.7%

NO

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

strict	GRANDVIEW ISD

Region

County District No

11

126904

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

77%

76%

YES

Dis LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 91% 68% 67% NO 56% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 19% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1%

objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 70% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 70% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

YES

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	12030
striot	CDANDVIEWICD	

Region

District GRANDVIEW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 090905

Region

16

**GRANDVIEW-HOPKINS ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early	lar early iving the and related childhood			Data Repor	·	
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	program; and (b) separate specture education class, separate so residential facility.			raigotorio	k roquirou roi	2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	#INA Math	#INA Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	#NA	#NA	knowledge and skills Summary Statement		57%	58.7%	YES	uata are ri	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District GRANDVIEW-HOPKINS ISD

Region 16
County District No 090905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to numbers level data repo	a are not
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level data repo	a are not

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GRANGER ISE

13

246905

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 52% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 4% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 72% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 56% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GRANGER ISD	
Diatrict	GRANGER ISD	

Region

County District No.

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or. they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

ictrict	

County District No **GRAPE CREEK ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	86%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		21, served inside the regular class less		13%	NO	14%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 201			ŭ			
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			l argets no	t required foi				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 54%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 49%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summe Stateme		81%	82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		1 1 1 1 1 1			72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported		

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District N

Region 15 nty District No 226907

District GRAPE CREEK ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators T		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	YES  14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

trict	GRAPELAND ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 83% 68% 67% NO 80% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 17% 10% 13% NO 2% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 54% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 57% YES 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 59% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 72% YES 73.1% Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Region 06
County District No 113902

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	(	20	DU	ınt	y	Di	st	ric	t I	Vο	

Region

District GRAPELAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators T		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	YES  14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**GRAPEVINE-COLLEYVILLE ISD** 

Region County District No 220906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?				
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	84%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO				
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		21, served inside the regular class less		21, served inside the regular class less		13%	NO	10%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	1%	YES				
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Repor	Ü					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	children aged 3 through 5		81.2%	YES		o small				
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported				
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 78%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level				
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 68%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported				
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level				
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.076	140		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported				
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported				

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_\_
GRAPEVINE-COLLEYVILLE ISD

Region

220906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators T		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District \_\_\_ **GREENVILLE ISD** 

Region

County District No

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?				
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	51%	NO				
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		21, served inside the regular class less		21, served inside the regular class less		13%	NO	15%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES				
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	•					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		81.2%	YES		o small district level				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported				
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 49%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small					
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 48%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported				
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level				
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.576	NO		ILS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported				
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported				

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	GREENVILLE ISD

Region

reported

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES inappropriate identification of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **GREENWOOD ISD** 

Region

County District No

18

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	90%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	1%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 97%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate se	lar early iving the a and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	_	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 61%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	, .	district level ot reported
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	INO		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	GREENWOOD ISD

**GREENWOOD ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**GREGORY-PORTLAND ISD** 

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	74%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	16%	NO	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early oprogram; and (b) separate speducation class, separate so	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	ŭ	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 69%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INU		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level oot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No

**GREGORY-PORTLAND ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District \_\_\_ **GROESBECK ISD** 

Region

County District No

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	83%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	66%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seeducation class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	J	
						residential facility.  7A: Percent of preschool	C					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		small district level
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 43%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				4370		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	GROESBECK ISD

**GROESBECK ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	033901
District	GROOM ISD	

Region

16

LEA State State **LEA Met** State **LEA** Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 0% 68% 67% NO 83% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 100% 10% 13% NO 8% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 57% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 57% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	033901
00004100	

Region

District GROOM ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GROVETON ISD

Region

County District No

06

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	ercent of children aged 3 through 5 IEPs attending (a) regular early hood program and receiving the rity of special education and related ces in the regular early childhood ram; and (b) separate special ation class, separate school or			•	ŭ	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 53%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	2203
strict	GROVETON ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	56% 57%		Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GRUVER ISD	

16

098901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 87% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 0% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 65% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 45% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	098901
District	GRUVER ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56% 57% YES		Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **GUNTER ISD** 

Region

County District No

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	89%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	11%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	17%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	93 /6	9970	TES	100 %	1123	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES Due to sn		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 88%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	76%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data arc n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INU		1 1 1 1 1	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	091917
istrict	GUNTER ISD	

Region

Due to small

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

LEA LEA State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or. they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

71%

69%

NO

education or in some other postsecondary

one year of leaving high school.

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

100%

99.1%

NO

Part B. and who have an IEP developed

and implemented by their third birthdays

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

YFS

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	GUSTINE ISD	

14

047903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 80% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO 7% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 7% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 42% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	047903
strict	GUSTINE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **GUTHRIE CSD** 

Region County District No 135001

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Baseline Data Reporting Year			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.