#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 12

10 129905

County Distric

MABANK 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	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>I</i> 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	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	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				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sco residential facility.						
	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	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 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	Due to 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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 invo 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)

District

Region County District No 129905

м	ΔR	ΔN	κ	ISD
1417	~ _	~''	••	100

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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 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		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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

06 154901

MADISONVILLE CISD

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	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 a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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	program; and (b) separate special 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 lev data are not reporte	
<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	Due t	o small
	87%	63%	NO	48%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers,	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 45%	Math NO	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	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	0%	0.5%	UNU			ES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Stateme		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 invo 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)

.....

District

Region	06
County District No	15490

MADISONVIL	I F	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

State

Target

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

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

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

06 170906

		ar 2011 (2011-12) Distr	rict		MAGNOLIA	ISD	
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?
81%	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	71%	YES
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	14%	NO
		5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -					

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	81%	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	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li><b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional</li> </ul>				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES			61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 66%	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 small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, o data are n	listrict level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	59%	NO		Statement 2	57%	56.7%	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		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	UVI		160	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statemen		72%	73.1%	YES		listrict 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, c	o small listrict 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 MAGNOLIA ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Annual te Performance Report Indicators et?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

06

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

Region 04 County District No 084801

MAINLAND PREPARATORY 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	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	#NA	#NA
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	#NA	#NA
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	#NA	#NA
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	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	Ũ	
	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	#NA	#NA	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 #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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math #NA	Math #NA	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	070	0.070				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 inve 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) District

MAINLAND PREPARATORY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	a are not
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 04 County District No 08480

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

107906

MALAKOFF 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 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	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	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education	ar early iving the		Baseline	Data Repor	ting Year	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	childhood oecial		Targets no	t required fo	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 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 62%	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	60%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary 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%	0.5%	NO		TES	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) County District No

District

MALAKOFF 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 07

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

Region County District No 109908

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

MALONE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State	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	Target? #NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	33%	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	11%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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
<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		(a) regular early nd receiving the ducation and related Baseline Data Reporting				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.	pecial		Targets fit	n required to	1771 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 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
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 44%	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		0.5%	NO			<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 olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of

9: Percent of districts with

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

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

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

County District No

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?
0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : 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
00/	09/	VEC		VEC	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left extend.	2.49/	220/	NO		o small s, district

District

inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES	YES	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
<b>10:</b> 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>12</u> strict No **109908** 

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

Region County District No 019910

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

District

MALTA 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	#NA	#NA	<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	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	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		osmall
	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 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 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
<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		0.070			0	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 inve 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

Region County District No 019910

MALTA	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No

10 057844

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

MANARA 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 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	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of	ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES		am; and (b) separate special attic state of the second s					
	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%	80.80/	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	56%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	80.8%	163		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	33%	NO		Statement 2	0170				
<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 leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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 invo 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

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

MANARA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

MANOR ISD

13 227907

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

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	77%	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	11%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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 recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
						education class, separate sc residential facility.	nool 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	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 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					district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	49%	NO	Knowledge 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		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	0.3%				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 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

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

MANOR	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MANSFIELD ISD

11 220908

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?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	72%	NO	<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	12%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	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.				e Data Repor	0	
	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	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 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 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
<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	078	0.378	NO		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 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

District

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

County District No MANSFIELD 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 11 220908

Region County District No

MARATHON ISD

18 022902

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

	1	1	1	r	r					r	r	
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 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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	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 services in the regular early childhood				Data Repor		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			l argets no	t required fo	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 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 demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summon				,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	67%	NO	KIIOWIEUYE AITU SKIIIS	Summary 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	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	0%	0.5%	NU		TES	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 02290

MARATHON 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No

13 027904

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

MARBLE FALLS 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	91%	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	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	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.				Data Repor	U	
	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 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 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	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%	NO		TEO	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 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 MARBLE FALLS 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 02790

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

Region County District No 189901

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

District

MARFA 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 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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	U U	
	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	96%	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 48%	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 sma	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 39%	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	070	0.070				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

MARFA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No 094904

MARION ISD

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

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	100%	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	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	1%	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 services in the regular early childhood				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				Targets no	t required fo	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 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	72%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1			_		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	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	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%	NO		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 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

Region County District No 094904

MARION	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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	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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No 073903

MARLIN ISD

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

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	76%	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	18%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	Percent of children aged 3 through 5 th IEPs attending (a) regular early ildhood program and receiving the ajority of special education and related nvices in the regular early childhood ogram; and (b) separate special		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	9378	3378	1123	100 %	123	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	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	31%	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
	83%	59%	NO	27%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	004	0.5%	NO		NE0	<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 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

Region County District No 07390

MARLIN ISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

102902

MARSHALL ISD

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?
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 IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	56%	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	IEPs aged 6 – r class less	10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	6%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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			
	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	,	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 58%	Reading NO	7B: 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 53%	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	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		0.070				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 olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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

MARSHALL ISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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 ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 161908

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MART 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	89%	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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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.				Data Repor	0	
	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 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 51%	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 56%	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	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	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 inve 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

Region County District No 161908

м	AR	т	ISD
	~''		100

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 Target?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

07 234905

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

MARTINS	MILL	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 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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.				Data Repor	U	
	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 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 56%	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	070	0.070			. 20	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 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

MARTINS	MILL	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 arget?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

LEA

State

Region County District No

MARTINSVILLE ISD

07 174909

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<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
<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

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		ial			0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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.				e Data Repor	-	
	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
	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 42%	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 38%	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 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	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs 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)

MARTINSVILLE ISD

District

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No 157901

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

MASON ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annua 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	85%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related					ting Year	
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial	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	94%	NO	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	48%	NO	demonstrate improved						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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with UEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary		72%	73.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 15790

MASON	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# **Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

03 158904

MATAGORDA 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 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	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.			1	I	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
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<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/			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	60%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	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	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						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	S with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 158904

MATAGORDA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number	a are not
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number	a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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	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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No 205904

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

District

MATHIS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annua 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	69%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	47%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	23%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	18%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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.				e Data Repor	0	
	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	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 47%	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 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

District

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

County District No

MATHIS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Annual te Performance Report Indicators et?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 02 20590

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

019903

District MAUD ISD

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 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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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	5%	NO
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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			Ũ	
	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	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 38%	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 31%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not repor</li> </ul>	
<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	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		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 019903

м	ΔI	JD	ISD
	~``		100

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 025905

MAY ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

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	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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Ye Targets not required for FFY 2				
						residential facility.	·····		I	1	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 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	Due tr	o small
	87%	63%	NO	47%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 47%	Math NO	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	001	0.5%	NO		VEO	<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 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

Region 15 County District No 02590

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

District

N/1	۸v	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MAYPEARL ISD

10 070915

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?
<b>1</b> : 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	57%	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	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regu childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
						residential facility.	1		I	1	I	
	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	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	Duct	o small
	87%	63%	NO	61%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 51%	Math NO	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		0.50(				<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	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

District

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

County District No

MAYPEARL 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 07091

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_\_

MCALLEN ISD

01 108906

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?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	62%	NO	<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	20%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	19%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	2%	NO
<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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early of	ar early iving the and related childhood			Data Report	Ũ	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp 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 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	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	64%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 61%	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	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%	NO		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 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

Region County District No 108906

MCALLEN 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region \_\_\_\_\_2

18 231901

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

MCCAMEY 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 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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.						
	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
<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					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	40%	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 Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	55%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to 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 olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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 23190

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 011905

MCDADE 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	#NA	#NA	<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	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	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	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		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 Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	73%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Glatement					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	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		0.5%				7C: Percent of preschool Sun children aged 3 through 5 State		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	5 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summ	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)

District

Region County District No 01190

MCDADE I	SD
----------	----

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

MCGREGOR ISD

12 161909

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

					LEA							
State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	89%	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	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<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				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				rargets no	t required fo	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 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	67%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /8	00.0 %	123		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	70%	NO		Statement 2	0.70				
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 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to sma	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070					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)

District

County District No MCGREGOR 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

MCKINNEY ISD

10 043907

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

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	80%	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	3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				Targets no	it required to	1 FF1 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 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	72%	NO	Knowledge 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 ICDs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	S Due to smal	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.3%					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 receivin special education services who report that		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

MCKINNEY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

 Region
 10

 strict No
 04390

Region County District No 090903

MCLEAN ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

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?
<b>1:</b> 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 a 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
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood</li> </ul>				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				Targets no	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 district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district l data are not repo</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading	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		Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	67%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary 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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Stater		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%				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 child receiving special education services who report that		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

MCLEAN 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 16 09090

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

12 Region County District No 161926 MCLENNAN CO ST JUVENILE CORRECTION FACILITY I 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	#NA	#NA
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	#NA	#NA
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	#NA	#NA
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	<b>6</b> : 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	U	
						residential facility.			1	1	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	#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	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	#NA	#NA	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	163		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	83%	59%	NO	#NA	#NA	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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	070	0.070				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		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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 12 County District No 161926 MCLENNAN CO ST JUVENILE CORRECTION FACILITY I

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12</b> : 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C. 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

12 Region County District No 161927 MCLENNAN CO ST JUVENILE CORRECTION FACILITY II 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	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	<b>6:</b> 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	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	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 #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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math #NA	Math #NA	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		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to smal	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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)

Region 12 County District No 16192 MCLENNAN CO ST JUVENILE CORRECTION FACILITY II

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C. 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

Region 034906 County District No

MCLEOD ISD

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

District

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 5% 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 maiority 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% YES 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 82% 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 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

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

Region County District No 034906

N	ICL	EO	) 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13:</b> 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 needs100%99.3%NO		NO		YES	
<b>10:</b> 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

162904

MCMULLEN COUNTY 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 I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> 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	94%	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	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
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial					
	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 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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 75%	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	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	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 County District No 16290

MCMULLEN COUNTY ISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

17 223902

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MEADOW 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 IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc regidential facility.	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Wath Wath Math Math Math Math Children aged 3 through 5 Statement	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 30%	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	h acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary		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		VES	<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%	NO		YES	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 MEADOW 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?
<b>9:</b> 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 reasonable 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MEADOWLAND CHARTER SCHOOL

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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoof facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 93%	Reading NO	<b>6:</b> 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				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
						residential facility.						
	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 leve	
	95%	99%	YES	93%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	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	29%	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
	83%	59%	NO	14%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		0.504	NG			7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to 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

District

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 13080

MEADOWLAND CHARTER SCHOOL

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

County District No 1018

Region

MEDICAL CENTER CHARTER SCHOOL

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	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	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				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special 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	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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	22%	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		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	22%	NO		Statement 2					
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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576			115	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 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 County District No 10180

MEDICAL CENTER CHARTER SCHOOL

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region20County District No010901

MEDINA ISD

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

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	100%	YES	<ul> <li>5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</li> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		68%	67%	NO	37%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<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				e Data Repor	0	
	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 20			r 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 63%	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	47%	NO	Knowedge and Skills	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		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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%	0.3%				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs 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

Region County District No 01090

MEDINA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number	a are not
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number	a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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	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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MEDINA VALLEY ISD

20 163908

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	95%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	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	19%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	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.				Data Repor	0	
	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	98%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<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 56%	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		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.078	NO		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 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 District No

District

MEDINA VALLEY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No

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

District MELISSA 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? 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 76% 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 4% 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 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 maiority 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% YES 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 66% 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

043908

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 043908

MELISSA	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

16 096904

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MEMPHIS 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 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	93%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> 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			ting Year r FFY 2011			
						residential facility. <b>74</b> : 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	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	36%	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		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	28%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> 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 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 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

Region County District No 09690

MEMPHIS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Target		State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No 164901

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

MENARD 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 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	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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	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		Baseline Data Reporting Year				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.		Targets no	ot required for	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 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 Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	43%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	olatoment i					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 29%	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/	0.5%	NO		VEO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with UPD who		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 invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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 16490

**MENARD ISD** 

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MERCEDES ISD

01 108907

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	72%	NO	<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	24%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	18%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sj	Percent of children aged 3 through 5 In 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 ication class, separate school or		Baseline Data Repo Targets not required fo			
						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	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		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		Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEO	<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 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

Region County District No 10890

MERCEDES 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 0

MERIDIAN ISD

12 018902

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	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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	14%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : 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 sp education class, separate sc residential facility.		Targets no	t required for	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 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	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					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	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	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		TES	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 invo 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)

District

Region County District No 018902

MERIDIAN	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

13 246801

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MERIDIAN WORLD SCHOOL LLC

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 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	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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 s education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<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/	¥50		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	53%	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 Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	0.5%	NO		VEO	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

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 24680

MERIDIAN WORLD SCHOOL LLC

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region

221904

County District No

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District

MERKEL 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	84%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due t	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 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	66%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 %	80.8 %	1123		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		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> 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 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 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 22190

MERKEL	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_

10 057914

District

MESQUITE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	e 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	85%	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	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
						education class, separate school or residential facility.			I	1	I	
	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	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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	00%	00.00/	¥50		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	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	54%	NO	_	Statement 2	57 /6	50.7 /0	123		
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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070				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 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

Region County District No 05791

MESQUI	TE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 147903

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	86%	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	59%	NO
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	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	29%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related				e Data Repor	0	
	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	ot required fo	r 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	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 36%	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	Summon				· ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	28%	NO	Knowledge and Skills	Summary 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		NO	<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%				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 olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

### MEXIA ISD

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 14790

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 10

MEYERPARK ELEMENTARY

04 101855

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	#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	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
<b>3A</b> : 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	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the			Baseline	e Data Repor	ting Year	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				t required for	U	
	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	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	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				100 %		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who         Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to 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 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)

04

Region County District No 10185

MEYERPARK ELEMENTARY

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

03 062906

MEYERSVILLE ISD

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?
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 <i>I</i> 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	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	6%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related				e Data Repor	Ũ	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			rargets no	t required for	r 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	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	44%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /8	80.878	123		o 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		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				50%		<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 invo 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)

District

Region County District No 062906

MEYERSVILLE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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 ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 197902

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MIAMI 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?		
<b>1:</b> 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	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	10%	YES		
<b>3A</b> : 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 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 Year					U	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES									
	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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) 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%	00.00/	YES				
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	75%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		o small district level		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	83%	59%	NO	63%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool								
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	0.5%	NO		VEO	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

Region County District No 197902

MIAMI	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 165802

District MIDLAND ACADEMY 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?
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	93%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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 s education class, separate sc	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	childron agod 2 through 5	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	48%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	TES		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				02 %		<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 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 small district level lot 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 165802

County District No

District MIDLAND ACADEMY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_\_1

18 165901

District

MIDLAND 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	72%	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	75%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	17%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with I 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recein majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate scl	ar early ving the and related childhood becial	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	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 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 62%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level 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 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needsSummary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			120		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 16590

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

10 070908

District

MIDLOTHIAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t 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	71%	NO	<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	3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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				Data Repor	0	
						education class, separate school or residential facility.			1	1	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	000/	00.00/	¥50		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	81%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 71%	Math	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	83%			71%	NO	<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 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 070908

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to smal	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MID-VALLEY ACADEMY

01 108804

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	64%	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	7%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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		residential		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				e Data Repor	U U	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			i ai goto ne			
	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	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	0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary 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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%			160	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 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

MID-VALLEY ACADEMY

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, distr level data are r reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 01

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 039

MIDWAY ISD

09 039905

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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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	e Data Repor	ting 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 no	ot required fo	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 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 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	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary					district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO	knowledge and skills	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		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%	NO		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 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 **MIDWAY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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%       NC		NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	lary school, had IEPs in effect at the time ft school, and were enrolled in higher ion or competitively employed within one 56% 57% YES		numbers	o small s, district a are not orted	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not

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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

09 039905

reported

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

Region12County District No161903

MIDWAY ISD

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

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	86%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	56%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	22%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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				0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> 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				Data Repor		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> 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	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 77%	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 69%	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 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%				with IEP's who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs 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

Region County District No 16190

MIDWAY ISD		MID	WAY	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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	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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No 166903

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

MILANO 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	86%	YES	5A: 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	14%	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	2%	YES		
<b>3A</b> : 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		21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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				e Data Repor ot required fo	0			
						education class, separate school or residential facility.				•				
	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	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		
	87%	63%	NO	50%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 39%	Math NO	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		0.5%	NO		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	with IEPS Who 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

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

MILANO 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to sma	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

06

Region

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

Region County District No 175910

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

MILDRED 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 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	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early	lar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	96%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			0	·		
	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 71%	Reading NO	7B: 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	54%	NO	Knowledge and Skills	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	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	0%	0.5%	NO			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)

District

Region County District No 175910

MILDRED ISD		MII	_DR	ED	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 200902

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MILES 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	#NA	#NA	<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	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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/hosy placements	ols, residential	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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <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 36%	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
<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 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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Region 20090

County District No

**MILES 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	level dat	s, district
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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	level dat	s, district

#### 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

10 070909

MILFORD 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	86%	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	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, 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	ar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		Targets no	ot required fo	r 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	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	89%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		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	67%	NO		Statement 2	5170	00.770	120		
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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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 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

Region County District No 070909

**MILFORD 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MILLER GROVE ISD

08 112907

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?
<b>1</b> : 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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending (a) regu- childhood program and rece majority of special educatior services in the regular early program; and (b) separate so education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	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 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 69%	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%	0.5%	NO		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 inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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

MILLER GROVE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 08 County District No 11290

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

Region County District No 184904

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

MILLSAP 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 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	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	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 sp education class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor t required fo	0	
						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	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	65%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	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%	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					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		TES	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 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

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

MILLSAP 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>11</u>

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 2

07 250903

District

MINEOLA 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	84%	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	11%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>				19%	NO	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	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 leve 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	59%	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		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	56%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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	070	0.070			. 20	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs 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

County District No 25090

Region

MIN	EOL	AL	SD	

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	r in the time ther 56% 57% YES level		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

182903

District	MINERAL WELLS 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	69%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	19%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>				2%	NO	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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 ot required fo	0	
	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 data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	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 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
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 45%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 numbers, district le	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs 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 18290

MINERAL WELLS 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No

MISSION CISD

108908

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

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?
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 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	15%	NO	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% 1% YE		YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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				e Data Repor	0	
	0070	0070		0070		education class, separate school or residential facility.		<u> </u>				
	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 lev data are not reporte	
	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	49%	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	50%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool	C					
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
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		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

01

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 108908

Ν	<b>/</b> ISS	ION	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	o are no longer in Ps in effect at the time enrolled in higher y employed within one transfer 56% 57% YES S6% 57% YES		number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

238902

MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE 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	87%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	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	17%	NO					
<b>3A</b> : 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	2%	NO					
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				e Data Repor ot required fo	0						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate sc residential facility.	hool or										
	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	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	123		o small district level					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	83%	59%	NO	46%	NO	7C: Dereant of preschool											
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		0%	01/	01/	0%	0%	0%	0% 0.5%	NO	children aged 3 through 5 Statement	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%	NO		YES	demostrate 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 lot reported					

18

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE ISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

State

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

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)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

LEA

Met

State

LEA

Region County District No

LEA

MONTAGUE ISD

State

State

169908

LEA Met

data are not reported

District

State

Performance Report Indicators	State Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?	Performance Report I		State Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	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	55%	NO				
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES				
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital1%1%		1%	YES	0%	YES			
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood		ng with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Report					0			
	95%	99%	YES	88%	NO	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc 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,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le data are not reporte					
	95%	99%	YES	88%	NO	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	71%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	TES		o small district level				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	Summary				57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	71%	NO		Statement 2	5176	00.770	120						
4A: 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 l					
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs 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	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 mean of improving somewires and results.		76%	77%	YES		o small district level				

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MONTAGUE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

01 108915

District

MONTE ALTO 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	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	87%	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	
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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 orBaseline Data Repor Targets not required for targets not required for			•	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79% 81.2% YE		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 22%	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 22%	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	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
IC days in a school year for children with IEPs						of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	data are n	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 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 MONTE ALTO 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 01 10891

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_\_

06 170903

M	ONTGOME	RY 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	88%	YES	<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	2%	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	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	5C: 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	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 Repo Targets not required f		•	0	
	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	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 79%	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 77%	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		0.070			0	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	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

MONT	COMED	
MONT	GOMER	1150

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

12 161910

MOODY 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	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	64%	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					
<b>3A</b> : 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					
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Ba						ding Reading Reading Reading with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the						•	0	
	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	ot required to							
	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	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	41%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	120		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	40%	NO		Statement 2										
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 district level					
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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 County District No 161910

MOODY	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

14 209902

MORAN 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	96%	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	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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/hos, placements	ols, residential	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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education	lar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate sc residential facility.	n; and (b) separate special on class, separate school or tial facility.		Targets no	ot required for	r 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	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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	39%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 28%	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				2070		<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	with IEP's who 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 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 20990

MORAN 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 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)

District

MORGAN 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 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	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	16%	NO
<b>3B:</b> 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) regul childhood program and recel majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	92%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 42%	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		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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 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

Region County District No 01890

MORGAN 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

State Performance Plan/ Annual

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

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)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

LEA

Met

State

LEA

State

State

0%

0.7%

NO

Region County District No

LEA

MORGAN MILL ISD

State

State

072910

LEA Met

District

State

76%

77%

YES

numbers, district level

data are not reported

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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/hosy 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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early of	ar early iving the and related			Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Targets not required for FFY 2			r 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
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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	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	67%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		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	67%	NO	_	Statement 2	5770	50.7 /0	123		
<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	0.5 %	NO			5 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of	09/	0.70/	NO		VEC	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w		760/	770/	VEC		o small

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)

District

County District No

MORGAN MILL ISD

Region

072910

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 17 County District No

MORTON ISD

040901

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	93%	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
<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 services in the regular early	lar early iving the and related			Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate s education class, separate sc residential facility.	Targets not required for FFY 201			r 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 65%	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 42%	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	078	0.070				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	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 04090

M	OR	то	ΝI	SD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

17 173901

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MOTLEY COUNTY 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 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	46%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	U U	
						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		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	75%	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	50%	NO	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Statement 2	57%	56.7%	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	070	0.3%			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 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)

District

	0	
County Distri	ct No	17

Region

MOTLEY CO	JUNTY	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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			number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

03 143902

MOULTON ISD

Cι	110	145

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	48%	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	19%	NO	
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		ial			0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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			e Data Repor	U		
	95%	99%	YES	94%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.							
	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	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not repor</li> </ul>		
<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					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	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				47 %		<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	vho 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 143902

Region

MOULTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Annual ate Performance Report Indicators get?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MOUNT CALM ISD

12 109910

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	96%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		schools, residential			0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp 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 demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	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 64%	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		demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					· · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	Math 59%	Math NO	36%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	uala ale fi	
<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		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	65 with IEP's who 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)

Cour

District

MOUNT CALM 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 Target?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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		YES	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>12</u> County District No 109910

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

201907

District

MOU	NT ENTERP	RISE ISD	

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	75%	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	25%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : 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	
<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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0		
	0070	0070	120	10070	120	education class, separate school or residential facility.							
	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	00%	00.00/	VEO			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	54%	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	38%	NO		Statement 2	0170	00.170	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						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 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	
MOUNT ENTERPRISE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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	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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

80 225902

MOUNT PLEASANT ISD

	r	1	· · · · · ·	r					1	1		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
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?	
<ol> <li>Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma</li> </ol>	75%	77%	YES	98%	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	15%	NO	
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : 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 Repor	ting Year		
	95%	99%	YES	98%	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,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	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	000/	00.00/	VEO			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to numbers, c		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	50.70/	YES		ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	51%	NO	5	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	TES			
4A: 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 78	0.070			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 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, c	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

MOUNT PLEASANT 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

08 080901

County District No

MOUNT VERNON ISD

Region

o **0809** 

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	91%	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	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		Targets no	ot required fo	r 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	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 %	00.078	125		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	47%	NO		Statement 2					
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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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 olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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

MOUNT VERNON 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 08 County District No 08090

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

11 049902

District

MUENSTER 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 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	46%	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	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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.				e Data Repor	U	
	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 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 56%	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		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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 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

MUENSTER 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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 ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

17 009901

District

MULESHOE 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 through 21, served inside the 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	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : 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	0	
	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 70%	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 63%	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		0.070			0	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 inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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

MULESHOE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 00990

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

Region12County District No167902

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

District

MULLIN 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 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	91%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei- majority of special education services in the regular early	lar early iving the and related childhood			Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp 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 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	29%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1			_		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 19%	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/			¥50	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 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 16790

MULLIN 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_\_1

06 198906

MUMFORD 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	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/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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 ot required fo	Ũ	
						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					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	75%	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	94%	YES	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Statement 2	57%	56.7%	TES		
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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.5%			163	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 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 lot 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 198906

Region

MUMFORD	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

State

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

State

LEA

Region County District No

State

LEA

MUNDAY CISD

State

District

09 138903

LEA Met

LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target
VES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class	68%

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>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</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						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 demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	800/	00.00/	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		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	67%	NO		Statement 2	5176	50.776	123		
4A: 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	0.5 /0	NO			of appropriate behaviors to SL	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

MUNDAY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng 13890

Region County District No

07 107908

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

MURCHISON 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		68%	67%	NO	80%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : 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	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	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	TES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	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				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 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 107908

MURCHISON 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

07 174904

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

NACOGDOCHES 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	76%	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	55%	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	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	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				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		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 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 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	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 61%	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 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needsSummary Statement 1 <b>8:</b> 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 disabilitiesSummary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			0			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			76%	77%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le data are not report	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	
•			-

NACOGD	OCHES 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

163903

District NATALIA 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	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	66%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	33%	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	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	YES 100% YES YES Solution of the		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. <b>7A:</b> 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 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 45%	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 the discrete bit data with	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				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 16390

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No

13 094903

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

NAVARRO 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	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	93%	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	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	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.				Data Repor	Ũ	
	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	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 66%	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 73%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district l data are not repo</li> </ul>	
<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		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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 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

Region County District No 09490

NAVARRO 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

06 093904

NAVASOTA 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	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : 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				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate s education class, separate sc residential facility.		rargets no	FFT 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 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	00 /0	00.0 %	123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	83%	59%	NO	49%	NO	<b>70</b> : Demonst of more than 1						
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		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
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	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)

District

County District No	
NAVASOTA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12</b> : 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

06

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

16 035903

District

NAZARETH 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	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : 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 ot required fo	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	TES	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		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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%	00.0%	TES		o small district level
	Math	Math 59%	Math	Math 29%	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	83%		NO	29%		<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 olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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 035903

Region

NΔ	ZAF	RET	ΉΙ	SD
		1		<b>U</b> U

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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 ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

IEPs

10 days in a school year of children with

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

Region County District No

NECHES ISD

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

District

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 81% 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% 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 maiority 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 100% YES 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 65% 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% 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

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

07 001906

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)

District

Region County District No 001906

NECHES 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

123905

or Targets District

NEDERLAND ISD

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	75%	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	3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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				e Data Repor	0		
						residential facility.			1				
	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	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>		
<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%	00.00/	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	74%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 69%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	not reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				0370		<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 olvement as a	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)

District

County District No

Region

NEDERL	ISD
	 100

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

079906

District

NEEDVILLE 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	96%	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	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 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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 recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
						education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	0001	00.00/	VEO		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	75%	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 Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	69%	NO		Statement 2					
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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U76	0.5%	NU		TEO	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 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

Region County District No 079906

**NEEDVILLE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

80 019905

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

NEW BOSTON 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	93%	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	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	18%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	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	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not repor</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 52%	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 43%	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	076	0.3%			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 inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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 019905

**NEW BOSTON 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 13 046901

District

NEW BRAUNFELS 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	84%	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	2%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential 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		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 77%	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 70%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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				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 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

COL	лну	DISU	ιcι	INU	
 			-		

NEW	BRAUNFELS 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 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)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_1

06 170908

District

NEW CANEY 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	75%	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	10%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> 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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	U U	
						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 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	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	80%	80.8%	TES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	55%	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/	0.5%	NO		VEO	<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 invo 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

District

NEW CANEY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 06 170908

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

Region County District No

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

District **NEW DEAL 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? 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 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 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 \* 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 maiority 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% YES 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 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

152902

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

NEW DEAL 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

07 230906

NEW DIANA 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 through 21, served inside the 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	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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	U	
	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 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 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 76%	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	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district l		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		0.070				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

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

NEW DIANA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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		YES	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 07

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

Region County District No 015805

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

District NEW FRONTIERS CHARTER SCHOOL

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	89%	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	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : 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	0	
	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 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 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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070				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 lot 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 \_\_\_\_\_01580

Region

NEW FRONTIERS CHARTER SCHOOL

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

153905

District	NEW HOME 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 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	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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	0	
	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	000	00.00/	¥50		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	88%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 75%	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						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with UPP and 5		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)

.

District

Region 17 County District No 15390

NEW HOME 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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		YES	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

NEW SUMMERFIELD ISD

07 037908

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?
<b>1:</b> 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	44%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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/hos, placements	ols, residential	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 services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				0	·		
	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	<ul> <li>numbers, district data are not report</li> </ul>	
<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 63%	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				0070		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with UPP who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	ES with IEP's who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs 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	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 \_\_\_\_ County District No

NEW SUMMERFIELD ISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

236901

District

NEW WAVERLY 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 through 21, served inside the 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	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	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 services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES							
	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	54%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 59%	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/	0.5%	NO			<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)

NEW WAVERLY ISD

District

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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	a are not
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

09 252902

District

NEWCASTLE 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 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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	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 services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		l argets no	t required for	r 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
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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	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	0078	00.078	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 63%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not repor</li> </ul>	
<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 ICPo who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to 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

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 09 strict No 252902

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 11 220817 NEWMAN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF ARLINGTON

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?
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	77%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	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 sp education class, separate sci	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math Math Math Math Math Math Children aged 3 through 5 Statement with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional Summary	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small						
		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 53%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1			YES	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 27%	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	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summ	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070					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)

Region County District No 22081 NEWMAN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF ARLINGTON

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C. 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

05 176902

NEWTON ISD

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?
<b>1</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	85%	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	57%	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	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending (a) regu- childhood program and rece majority of special educatior services in the regular early program; and (b) separate so education class, separate so residential 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	hildren aged 3 through 5 Summary 79% vith IEPs who		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 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 41%	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%	0.5%	NO		TES	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 lot 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 176902

NEWTON 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

089903

District

NIXON-SMILEY 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?
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	69%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential 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		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 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 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		not 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	through 5 Statement 1 81% 82.7% YES			o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			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 lot 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

NIXON-SMILEY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 16

09 169902

NOCONA ISD

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?
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	57%	NO
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	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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
<b>3B:</b> 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 s education class, separate sc	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 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 48%	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 39%	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 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs       Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs								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

Region County District No 169902

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

03 062902

.

-	
NORDHEIM ISD	

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		68%	67%	NO	94%	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	6%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0		
	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 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 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 district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 30%	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		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				of appropriate behaviors to Summary	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	

District

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

NORDHEIM ISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

NORMANGEE ISD

06 145906

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?
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 IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	41%	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	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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		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	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.	pecial	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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	96%	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 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	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	63%	NO	knowledge and skills	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		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		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.5 %	NO		TLS			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	_

Region

NORMANGEE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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)

LEA

State

Region County District No

NORTH EAST ISD

State

015910

LEA Met

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	69%	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	78%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	14%	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	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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				
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special 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	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	68%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80 %	80.878	123		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	60%	NO		Statement 2	0.70				
<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				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 JEPs 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

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

County District No

Region

NORTH	EAST	ISD
	-/.01	

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

04 101909

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_\_

NORTH	FOREST	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	58%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	46%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	29%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	21%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of 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 ices in the regular early childhood ram; and (b) separate special ation class, separate school or lential facility.			e Data Repor	0	
	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	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 42%	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 37%	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	<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				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district leve 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 inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	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)

District

County	District No	
-		

Region

NORTH	FOREST 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

NORTH HOPKINS ISD

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

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	100%	YES	<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	10%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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 s education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			0	
	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 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 37%	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 34%	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	00/	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		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 volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, c	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

NORTH HOPKINS ISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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	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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 08 strict No 112906

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

80 139911

NORTH LAMAR 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	84%	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	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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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 Yes Targets not required for FFY 2				0		
	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	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 70%	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 71%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills 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 /0	0.5 /0				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	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

NORTH LAMAR 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 in some other postsecondary       71%       69%         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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 08 County District No 13991

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)

Region County District No

NORTH ZULCH ISD

154903

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?
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		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education	ar early iving the 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.			FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: 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	53%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		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	47%	NO		Statement 2	5776	50.7 /6	123		
4A: 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	070	0.070				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 does in a coheck reserve to bilder with	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv	ho report that	76%	77%	YES		o small district level

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

06

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)

District

County	DISTRICT NO	
-		

Region

NORTH ZULCH IS	D
----------------	---

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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		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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_

09 244905

District

NORTHSIDE 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 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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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				
	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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 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
<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         with IEPs who       demonstrate improved use         of appropriate behaviors to       Summary         meet their needs       Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070						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	
NORTHSIDE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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		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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

20 015915

District

NORTHSIDE 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	78%	YES	<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	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	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	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				
	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	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 63%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<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		0.070			. 20	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 lot 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

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	56%	57%	YES Due to sm numbers, dia level data are reported		s, district a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

NORTHWEST ISD

11 061911

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

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	73%	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	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	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	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				
	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 l	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	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 77%	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 71%	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	0%	0.5%	NU			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 06191

NORTHWEST 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

NORTHWEST PREPARATORY

101848

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	37%	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	49%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special</li> </ul>				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				Targets not required for 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	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 30%	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/	¥50	,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	27%	NO		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		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	070	0.070	NO		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		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

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 101848

NORTHWEST PREPARATORY

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

10 057809

District

NOVA 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	#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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	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 services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special		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		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	800/	90.99/	VES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	100%	YES	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	100%	YES		Statement 2	0170	00.170	120		
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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070	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 child receiving special education services who report that		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

NOVA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

<u>10</u>

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

Region County District No

057827

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

NOVA ACADEMY (SOUTHEAST) 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	70%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	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				
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	services in the regular early childhood			Targets no	t required fo	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 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 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	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of						district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	53%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary 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	078	0.5 %	NO		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 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)

District

Region County District No 05782

NOVA ACADEMY (SOUTHEAST)

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	a are not
<b>11</b> : 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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No 042906

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

NOVICE 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 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/hos, placements	ols, residential	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 services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	0		
	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	<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 0%	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					· · ·	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	0%	NO	Knowledge and Skills	Summary 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%	0.5%	NO		TES	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	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 042906

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 069902

District

NUECES CANYON CISD

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	92%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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.				e Data Repor	U	
						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	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	44%	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 Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	39%	NO	70 0						
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEO	<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 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

NUECES CANYON 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 15 06990

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_\_2

03 235904

District

NURSERY 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		68%	67%	NO	75%	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	
<b>3A</b> : 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					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	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		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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs who Stateme demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summa	Summary Statement 1 80% Summary Statement 2 57%	80%		YES			
	87%	63%	NO	75%	NO						Due to small numbers, district lev		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			57%		YES	data are not reported		
	83%	59%	NO	50%	NO		Statement 2						
<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	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to sma numbers, distric data are not rep		
		0.5%	NO				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 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 23590

NURSERY ISD		NU	RS	ER	Υ	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

13 227804

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

NYOS CHARTER SCHOOL

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 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		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	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	· ·	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 61%	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	070	0.070				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 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)

County District No 2

NYOS CHARTER SCHOOL

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 13

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_1

06 145907

ets District

OAKWOOD 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 <i>l</i> 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	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ls, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	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 sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early ving the and related childhood becial			e Data Repor	U U	
	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 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 43%	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	078	0.5%	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 invo 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)

District

County District No

Region

OAKWOOD 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

02 205905

ODEM-EDROY 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 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 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	13%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – r class less	10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	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	95%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers,	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 63%	Reading NO	7B: 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 53%	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
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	UNU		TES	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 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

ODEM-EDROY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 20590

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

17 153903

District

O'DONNELL 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	50%	NO	<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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
						residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	28%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math	Math NO	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 significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		59%		17%	NO	<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 invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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 \_\_\_\_\_

O'DONNELL 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

LEA

Region County District No

084802

ODYSSEY ACADEMY INC

District

State Farget	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?	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	88%	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	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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	#NA	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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early of	ar early iving the and related			Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		rargets no	it required to	1 FF1 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	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	72%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	TES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	62%	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/	0.5%	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 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

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

ODYSSEY ACADEMY INC

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

04

Region

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

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No 05

OGLESBY ISD

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

District

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 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 10% 11% NO 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 21% NO \* 1% 1% YES 8% "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 maiority 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 83% 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 83% 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 40% 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 60% 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)

District

Region County District No 05090

OGLESBY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region15County District No200906

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

District

OLFEN 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	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	89%	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	11%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	0070	0070	120	10070	120	education class, separate school or						
	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, c data are n	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	Summarv	000/	00.00/	VEO		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	60%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 40%	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						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	
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	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 200906

OLFEN	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No 252903

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

District

OLNEY 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	83%	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	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	education class, separate school or residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool summary		79%	81.2%	YES		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Statement 1 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	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	58%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	001070			o 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 n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> 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 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	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 25290

**OLNEY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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		YES	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

State

Target

75%

State

Rate

77%

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating

from high school with a regular diploma

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

State

Met

Target?

YES

Region 17 County District No 140905

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

OLTON ISD Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District LEA State LEA Met LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met State Rate State Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day 67% NO 68% 67% NO 71% YES

	75%	11%	YES	67%	NO	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	33%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li><b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool</li> </ul>				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are n	
<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	Due to	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 53%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	
<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 numbers, o	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.076	NO		TEG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	data are no	
<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	Due to numbers, o data are no	district level

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 14090

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

06 187910

ONALASKA 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 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	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education sentices in the regular early	ar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood			l argets no	ot required fo	r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.       7A: Percent of preschool		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	59%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /0	00.070	123		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 61%	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				01%		<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 lot 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 187910

**ONALASKA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 01 County District No 108801

ONE STOP MULTISERVICE CHARTER SCHO 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	50%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with 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	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 91%	Reading NO	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>74: Percent of preschool</li> </ul>				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool		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 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 5%	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 17%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		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	0 /0	0.576			123	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		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)

Region County District No 10880

District ONE STOP MULTISERVICE CHARTER SCHO

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

02 125903

ORANGE GROVE 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 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 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	6%	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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of	ar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		Targets no		11112011	
	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	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	51%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		orropondu
<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%	0.3%				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 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

Region

125903

ORANGE GROVE ISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

181905

District

ORANGEFIELD 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	74%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	84%	YES
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	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	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 recen majority of special education services in the regular early	ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			5	·		
	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	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	65%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070				o 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				0070		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 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 lot 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

OR/	ANGI	EFIEL	_D 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

07 230903

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

ORE CITY 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	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	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 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 51%	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 76	0.576			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 inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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 23090

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 0\*

12 014804

District

ORENDA CHARTER SCHOOL

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	50%	NO	<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	50%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	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		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 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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 32%	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	070	0.070			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 inve 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

Region

ORENDA CHARTER SCHOOL

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

<u>12</u> 014804

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)

Region County District No

07 201908

**OVERTON ISD** 

District

			_		LEA					_		
State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	80%	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	23%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos 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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education	ar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	-	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.	pecial		Targets no	ot required fo	r 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	95%	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	000/	00.00/			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	71%	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	<b>57</b> 0/	50.70/	¥50		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO	·····	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%	0.3%				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	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for phildrap with disphilition	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot 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)

District

Region County District No 201908

٥V	ERT	ON	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?
<b>9:</b> 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
<b>10:</b> 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 **0** 

<u>17</u> 051901

PADUCAH 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 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	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		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES		
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	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 program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
		education class, separate school or residential facility.		nooi or										
	Math Math Math Math Math <i>children a</i> with IEPs	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	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	44%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		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	50%	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 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		0.5 /0					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 lot 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 05190

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

14 104907

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PAINT CREEK 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 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	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 83%	Reading NO	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receil majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential 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		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 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 67%	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	e rate of s of greater than children with 0% 0.5% NO YES VES vibilities improved use of appropriate behaviors to State		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level					
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		0.5%	UVI		YES	demonstrate improved use 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 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

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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%		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>14</u>

Region County District No

15 048903

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PAINT ROCK 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 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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	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	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		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 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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 38%	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	070	0.5%				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		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

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

<u>15</u> 048903

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

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_\_1

03 158905

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

PALACIOS 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	67%	NO	<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	17%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> 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 71%	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 68%	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 10 days in a school year for children with	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
IEPs						of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	data are n	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 lot 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

PALACIOS 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number	a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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	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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 03 158905

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

07 001907

PALESTINE 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	92%	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	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading	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	0	
								l 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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	00%	00.00/	VEO		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	63%	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	60%	NO		Statement 2	0170	00.170	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		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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		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 00190

PALESTINE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No

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

PALMER 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 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	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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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.				e Data Repor t required fo	0	
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	73%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		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	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	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with ICPo who		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	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 070910

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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 ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No 1

PALO PINTO ISD

11 182906

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

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?	
<b>1:</b> 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	63%	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	
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 - 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				Data Repor	0		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				l argets no	t required fo	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 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	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	50%	NO	_	Statement 2	5776	50.776	1123			
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 district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070	No		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	vho 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

PALO PINTO 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

<u>11</u> 182906

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

Region County District No 090904

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

District

PAMPA 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 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	11%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	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	0	
	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	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 47%	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		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%				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 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 090904

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

16 033902

District

PANHANDLE 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 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	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
<b>3B:</b> 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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	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	97%	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 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 72%	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			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 special education services w schools facilitated parent inve 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

PANHANDLE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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		YES	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 16 County District No 03390

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

183801

**PANOLA CHARTER SCHOOL** 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?
<b>1</b> : 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 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	33%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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
<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 services in the regular early	ar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate spectrum education class, separate so residential facility.			raigete ne	a roquirou ro		
	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	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 t	o small
	87%	63%	NO	50%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	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	001	0.5%	NO		VEO	<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 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 County District No 18380

PANOLA CHARTER SCHOOL

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PANTHER CREEK CISD

042905

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	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	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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
<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 recei majority of special education	ar early iving the and related			Data Report	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speeducation class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		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	Due to numbers, c	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are no	
<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	Due to	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, c data are no	
	83%	59%	NO	42%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary 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	Due to numbers, c	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	N		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	data are no	
<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	Due to numbers, c data are no	listrict level

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PANTHER CREEK CISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 15 04290

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 PARADI Region11County District No072801

District PARADIGM ACCELERATED CHARTER SCHOO

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	65%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with 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	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	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	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 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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 33%	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	070	0.070				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 olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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 County District No 07280

District PARADIGM ACCELERATED CHARTER SCHOO

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_2

11 249906

District

P	ΔR	ISE	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annu Performance Report Indicator t?		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	89%	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	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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	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				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	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	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	79%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 59%	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	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%	NU		TES	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 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

County District No

Region

PAR	<b>ADISE</b>	

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

<u>11</u> 249906

Region County District No 139909

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PARIS 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	96%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	4%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	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.				e Data Repor	0	
	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	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 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		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 53%	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	070	0.070				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 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

Region County District No 139909

PARIS 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 101917

PASADENA 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 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	69%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	56%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	17%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	18%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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.				ting Year r 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	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 52%	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 51%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills 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	0.070				demonstrate improved use		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 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

County District No 10191

Region

PASADENA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

19 071803

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PASO DEL NORTE

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annua Performance Report Indicators t?		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	60%	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	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 83%	Reading NO	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential 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		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 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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 33%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills 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	076	0.5%			163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district level data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<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

County District No PASO DEL NORTE

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

063906

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

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	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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.				ting Year r 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 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 33%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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	078	0.5 %	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		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 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>17</u>

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

Region County District No 013902

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

PAWNEE ISD

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?
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	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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp 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 demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small — numbers, district lev	
	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 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Durit	
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	63%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of						o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	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	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%			163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		district level 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 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

Region County District No 013902

P	AV	٧N	EE I	SD
---	----	----	------	----

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	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	
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 02

04 020908

District

PEARLAND 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	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	68%	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		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	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.		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	75%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 %	80.8 %	1123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	70%	NO		Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	0.5%			VEO	<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		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 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

PEARLAND 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?
<b>9:</b> 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%       N		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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 04 020908

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

20 082903

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?	
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	21%	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	21%	NO	
<b>3A</b> : 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		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and relatedBaseline Data Reporting Year					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial	Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	with IEPs who		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	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	43%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 %	00.076	TES		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	45%	NO		Statement 2	0170					
<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	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 olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported	

PEARSALL ISD

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PEARSALL 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?
<b>9:</b> 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%       NC		NO		YES	
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

11 184908

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PEASTER 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	33%	NO	<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	33%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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	<b>6:</b> 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				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	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 70%	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 67%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level 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	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 70	0.570			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 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

County District No

Region

PEASTER 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

18 195901

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

PECOS-BARSTOW-TOYAH 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 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	91%	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	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	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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	0	
						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	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	53%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		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		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				55%		<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 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

Region County District No 19590

PECOS-BARSTOW-TOYAH 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           Target?         Target		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region 10 County District No 057802

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

District PEGASUS SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS AND

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	94%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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	0	
	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 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 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		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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 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 County District No 10

rict No 057802

District PEGASUS SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS AND

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	a are not
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No

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

PENELOPE 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 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	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		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	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		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 201			0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		I argets not required for			r 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 46%	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	38%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		or 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%	0.3%	UNU		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 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

Region County District No 10991

PENELOPE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

09 119903

PERRIN-WHITT CISD

Region

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
			Target:		Target?					Talget:		Target:
<ol> <li>Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma</li> </ol>	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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos 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				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special 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	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%	00.0%	163		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	56%	NO		Statement 2	07.70	00.170	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	0,0	0.070	No		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 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

	_
PERRIN-WHITT 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 09 County District No 119903

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

Region County District No

16 179901

PERRYTON ISD

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

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	82%	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	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	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				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	TES	99%	YES	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 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
3C: 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	Due tr	o small
	87%	63%	NO	56%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 52%	Math NO	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	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%	NU		TES	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 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

County District No 17990

Region

PEF	RRY	TON	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PETERSBURG ISD

17 095904

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	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> 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 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	5%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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.				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	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 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 27%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	district level 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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.5 %	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 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

County District No 0

PETERSBL	JRG 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>17</u>

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 0

09 039903

PETROLIA 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 <i>through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day</i>		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 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 96%	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.				Data Repor	0	
	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
<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 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	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				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 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

District

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PETROLIA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region ng 03990

Region County District No 013903

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PETTUS 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	64%	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	4%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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				e Data Repor	0		
					_	education class, separate so residential facility.	chool or						
	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	000/	00.00/				
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	67%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 46%	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						<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	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 01390

PETTUS 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 172905

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

PEWITT CISD

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	70%	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	10%	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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	g 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							
	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 57%	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	47%	NO	Knowledge and Skills	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	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%				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 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 172905

Р	E	w	IT	т	CI	S	D

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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       56%       57%		YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

13 227904

District

PFLUGERVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annu te Performance Report Indicato		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	72%	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	13%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	g 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				
	90 /0	9970	123	9970	1123	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		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%	00.00/	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	61%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				5178		IO Statement 2 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	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	with IEPs who 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

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 13

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

01 108909

District

PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Annu Performance Report Indicator et? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged		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	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
<b>3A</b> : 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			1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES					e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			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 lev data are not reporte	
<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	Dura t	
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	61%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of						o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	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	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	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	UNU .		TES	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Sum		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 lot reported

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

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 108909

PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<ul> <li>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</li> <li>14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary and IEPs in offect at the time.</li> </ul>		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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES Due to s numbers, level data reporte		s, district ta are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

116801

PHOENIX CHARTER SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annua te 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	83%	YES	<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	17%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	1% YES 0%		YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES					e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5		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	,	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 46%	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 38%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	TC: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to     Summai Statement	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		0.070					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 11680

PHOENIX 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

11 061903

District

PILOT POINT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annu te Performance Report Indicato		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	50%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	20%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	5 5		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	79%	81.2%	YES		
	Main	Main	Main	Main	Main	with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Statement 1	19%	01.2%	163		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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	0.000	00.00/			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	66%	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	56%	NO	-	Statement 2	57%	56.7%	163		
4A: 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 UED withs	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.570				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

County District No 0

PILOT POINT 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES Due to s numbers, a level data a reported		s, district a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>11</u>

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

07 092904

PINE TREE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annua 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	79%	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	5%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	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. 7A: Percent of preschool						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	63%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	83%	59%	NO	61%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		VES	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 <b>Summary</b> Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%			160			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

District

PINE TREE 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 07

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PINEYWOODS COMMUNITY ACADEMY

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?			
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	96%	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			
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			e Data Repor	porting Year I for 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	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 52%	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 45%	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	070	0.076				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 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)

County District No 00380

Region

PINEYWOODS COMMUNITY ACADEMY

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	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		YES	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

**4B:** Percent of districts that have a

IEPs by race and ethnicity

significant discrepancy in the rate of

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

LEA

Region County District No

PITTSBURG ISD

032902

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

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?
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	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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	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 s education class, separate so residential 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 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	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	72%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /8	00.078	120		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		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and exclusions 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
suspensions and expulsions of greater than 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	

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

08

Due to small

numbers, district level

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)

District

County District No

PIT	<b>FSBU</b>	RG	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region 17 County District No 251902

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

District

PLAINS 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	84%	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	9%	YES		
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			Data Repor	orting Year or FFY 2011				
	Math     Math     Math     Math     Math     Math     Math     Summary Statement	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 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 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 district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			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 olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

17 095905

District

PI	IVI	FW	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	69%	NO	<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	22%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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			1%	1% 1% YES		0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES					Data Repor	0	
	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 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 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070						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 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

District

PLAINVIEW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	te State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators et?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

 Region
 17

 strict No
 09590

Region County District No 043910

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PLANO 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	76%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs ottografing (a) regular activ</li> </ul>		1% 1% YES		YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	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 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
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 68%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<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	YES		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	NU		TES			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 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 043910

PLANO	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 08 019912

District

PLEASANT GROVE 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	64%	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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early.</li> </ul>		1% 1% YES		0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> 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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	97%	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 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 66%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district leve 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	ES <b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statement 1 Statement 1 statement 1 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								72%	73.1%	YES	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 inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	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)

District

PLEASANT GROVE ISE	)

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 08 County District No. 01991

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

20 007905

PLEASANTON ISD

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 t?		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	72%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1% 1% YES		YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	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.				e Data Repor	0	
	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		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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 63%	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 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs       Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070						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 rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot 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

PLEASANTON 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 itate Performance Report Indicators rget?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region 16 County District No 117904

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

PLEMONS-STINNETT-PHILLIPS CISD

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	92%	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	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1% 1% YES		0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> 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 sp	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Y Targets not required for FFY			0	
						education class, separate sc residential facility.					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
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	00%	00.00/	VEO		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	56%	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	46%	NO		Statement 2	5170	30.770	120		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	S <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 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.5 /0	NO		113			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 small district level lot 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

Region

PLEMONS-STINNETT-PHILLIPS CISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

<u>16</u>

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

01 031909

District

POINT ISABEL 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	67%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day</i>		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 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO	
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)     Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			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 59%	Reading NO	children aged 3 through 5 Summ		80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small _ numbers, district leve		
	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	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				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs 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 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

County District No 0

POINT ISABEL 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 01

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

PONDER ISD

061906

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 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	56%	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	16%	NO		
<b>3A</b> : 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/hos placements	ols, residential	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 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.		Reading with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood renorms and (b) according to program 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		o small		
	95%	99%	YES	96%	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 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Durt			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	79%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	o small district level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 72%	Math NO	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	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%	NO		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 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 061906

– DC	ONDEF	חסוכ
- г u	INDER	130

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_1

11 184901

District

POOLVILLE 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 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	8%	YES		
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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. 7A: Percent of preschool				e Data Repor ot required fo	0			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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)		61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>			
<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	72%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	120		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	72%	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		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs 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 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

POOLVILLE	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

<u>11</u> 184901

Region County District No

015801

**Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

POR VIDA 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	23%	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	84%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	63%	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		
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 94%	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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	0			
										1				
	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	82%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		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							
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	27%	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		not reported		
	83%	59%	NO	14%	NO	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Statement 2	57%	56.7%	163				
<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 76	0.5 /0			115	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs 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 small district level lot 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

District

POR	VIDA	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 20 County District No 01580

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

02 178908

PORT ARANSAS 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 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	87%	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	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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		*			1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	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	ot required fo		
	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 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	54%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 %	00.070	123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	54%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	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 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)

District

County District No

PORT	ARANSAS IS	SD.
FUNI	ANANGAGIG	ענ

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 02 strict No 178908

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

05 123907

PORT ARTHUR 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	78%	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	13%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	22%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES				rargets no	t required for FFY 201		
	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	· ·	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	55%	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		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	57%	NO	70 0						
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
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	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

County District No 12390

Region

PORT ARTHUR 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_\_1

05 123908

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

District

PORT NECHES-GROVES 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	93%	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	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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	0	
	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	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 75%	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 67%	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			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		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

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

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 123908

PORT NECHES-GROVES 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 015814

POSITIVE SOLUTIONS CHARTER SCHOOL

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	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	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
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool		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 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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 20%	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		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			. 20	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		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 County District No 01581

District **POSITIVE SOLUTIONS 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 085902

POST ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

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	80%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	84%	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	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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		*			1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	95%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		Targets no	ot required for	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 district level
	95%	99%	YES	95%	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 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	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	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Region 08590

County District No

POST 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No 007906

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

POTEET 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 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 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	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	11%	NO			
<b>3A</b> : 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			
<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		g 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 FE					Baseline Data Reporting Year rgets not required for FFY 2011		
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.				2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level			
	95%	99%	YES	99%	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	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			
			-			demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level			
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 49%	Math NO	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/	0.5%	NO		VEO	<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 invi 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

Region County District No 007906

POTEET 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region20County District No247904

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

District

POTH 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	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		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		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 71%	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 53%	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       Summary         children aged 3 through 5       Statement 1         with IEPs who       demonstrate improved use         of appropriate behaviors to       Summary         meet their needs       Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs								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

Region County District No 24790

POTH ISD

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

10 091913

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

POTTSBORO 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	65%	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	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		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	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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 66%	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       Summary         children aged 3 through 5       Statement 1         with IEPs who       demonstrate improved use         of appropriate behaviors to       Summary         meet their needs       Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			0			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 small district level lot 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

POTTSBORO 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

13 028906

District

PRAIRIE LEA 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		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 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	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 2011				
						residential facility.			1	1	1	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		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	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<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					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	50%	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	17%	NO		Statement 2	5170	50.778	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	7C: Percent of preschool       Summary         children aged 3 through 5       Statement 1         with IEPs who       demonstrate improved use         of appropriate behaviors to       Summary         meet their needs       Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%			163			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 PRAIRIE LEA 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 02890

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_\_

09 169909

District

PRAIRIE VALLEY 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 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	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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 recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor t required fo	U U	
						<ul><li>residential facility.</li><li>7A: Percent of preschool</li></ul>	Summary					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	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	44%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		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	44%	NO		Statement 2	0.70				
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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			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 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

Region County District No 169909

PRAIRIE	VALLEY	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

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

Region County District No

139912

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

PRAIRILAND 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	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	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> 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 rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			• Data Repor ot required fo	0	
						education class, separate so residential facility.	nool 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	98%	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	• • • • ·				
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	65%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	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						<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	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)

District

Region County District No 139912

DD	VIDI	ΙΛΝ	D ISI	n
гκ	ΑΙΚΙ	LAN	וסו ע	J

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

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

PREMIER LEARNING ACADEMY

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 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	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	#NA	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	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 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 50%	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		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070	NO		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 inve 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

084805

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

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No 084805

Region

PREMIER 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	<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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 \_\_\_\_1

PREMONT ISD

02 125905

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 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	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	6%	NO
<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 services in the regular early	lar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	•	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			raigets no		11112011	
	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	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 achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 51%	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	38%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary 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%	0.5%	NO		TES	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 12590

PREMONT 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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 ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

18

PRESIDIO 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 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	86%	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	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 96%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	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 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 67%	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	0.5 /0			110	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 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

Region County District No 189902

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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	a are not
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region12County District No167904

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

District

PRIDDY 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 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	0%	YES			10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> 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 Targets not required for FF		Ũ	
						<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool	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 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	100%	YES	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		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	100%	YES	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	0.5%	NO		VEO	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 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

Region County District No 16790

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

LEA

State

Region County District No

PRINCETON ISD

State

10 043911

LEA Met

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	52%	NO
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	IEPs aged 6 – r class less	10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : 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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	5 1% YE	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related				Data Repor	•	
	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	r 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	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	0078	00.078	123		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	49%	NO		Statement 2					
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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				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 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

Region County District No 04391

PRINCETON ISD	P	RIN	CET	ON	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

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

Region County District No

16 098903

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

PRINGLE-MORSE CISD

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	46%	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
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>5: Demonst of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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) senarate special			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			-		1	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		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	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	163		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO							
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	201	0.50(				<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 invo 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

PRINGLE-MORSE CISD

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?
<b>9:</b> 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	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	<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	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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>16</u>

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_1

01 108910

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

PROGRESO 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 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	50%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	86%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	40%	NO	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO		
<b>3A</b> : 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		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading	<b>6</b> : 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				ne Data Reporting Year not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.			I	1	1			
	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 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	000	00.00/	¥50				
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	40%	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	42%	NO		Statement 2	0170	00.170					
4A: 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 EDe who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NU		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 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)

District

County District No

Region

PROGRESO 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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		number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted		
<b>11</b> : 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	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<ul> <li>14B: Percent of youth 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.</li> </ul>		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/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 101853

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

PROMISE COMMUNITY SCHOOL District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annua Performance Report Indicators t?		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	90%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : 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 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : 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 2017			
						residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	93%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					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	80%	NO	7C: Dereent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		X50	children aged 3 through 5 S	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
<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

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 10185

**PROMISE COMMUNITY 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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 **0** 

PROSPER ISD

10 043912

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?	
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	56%	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	8%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : 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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> 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				
	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 fo	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 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 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 77%	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 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	078	0.5 %				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 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

Region County District No 043912

Р	RO	SP	ER	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?
<b>9:</b> 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	<b>13</b> : 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
<b>10:</b> 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : 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	<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	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> 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	<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 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/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.