Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	QUANAH ISD	

09

099903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 92% 68% 67% NO 86% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 8% 10% 13% NO 3% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 32% 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 31% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region	09
County District No	099903
·	

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	QUEEN CITY ISD

80

034907

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 67% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 9% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 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 52% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	034907
istrict	QUEEN CITY ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District **QUINLAN ISD**

Region County District No 116908

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	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	55%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education	arly u the d 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	FFY 2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		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	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 50%	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 46%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	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	116908
)istrict	OUINI AN ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District **QUITMAN ISD**

Region

County District No

07

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met 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		67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	12%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged swith IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate so	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	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	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: 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 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	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	070	0.3%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	emonstrate improved use fappropriate behaviors to Summary		73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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 _	200904
District	QUITMAN ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in 56% secondary school 55% YES		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District

RADIANCE ACADEMY OF LEARNING

County District No

Region

20

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	50%	NO	5A: 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	50%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FEY 201						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	24%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	33%	NO		Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		\/F0	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a conspecial education services when schools facilitated parent invideans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No ______015

RADIANCE ACADEMY OF LEARNING

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

strict	RAINS ISD	

Region

County District No

07

190903

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 93% 68% 67% NO 68% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 12% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 71% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 57% YES 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 64% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 72% YES 73.1% Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	190903
DAING IOD	

Region

District RAINS ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	RALLS ISD	

Region

County District No

17

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 47%	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 38%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2			YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	09/	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0.5% NO	YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported				
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	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	0549
 DALLO 10D	

District RALLS ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	RAMIREZ CSD

02

066005

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	
District	RAMIREZ CSD	

Region

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

one year of leaving high school.

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	RANCH ACAD
District	II/III/II/II/II/II

County District No DEMY

Region

07

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	40%	NO	5A: 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	40%	NO	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading 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		as attending (a) regular early bid program and receiving the of special education and related as in the regular early childhood as; and (b) separate special bin class, separate school or Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 19%	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 14%	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		VEQ	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	% 0.5% NO YES	ILS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	RANCH ACADEMY

RANCH ACADEMY

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District

RANDOLPH FIELD ISD

Region 20
County District No 015906

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	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 121, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and recein majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scores.	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. 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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 82%	Reading NO	7B: 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 70%	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	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.3%	NO		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent 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
District	RANDOLPH FIELD ISD

Region 20 015906

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

one year of leaving high school.

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	RANGER ISD
District	IVARIOLIV IOD

14

067907

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 50% 68% 67% NO 67% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 9% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 39% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 39% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	067907
District	RANGER ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	RANKIN ISD	

18

231902

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	231902
	_	
Dietrict	RANKIN ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Di

County District No

Region

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	#NA	#NA	5A: 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	#NA	#NA	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class. separate school or			Baseline Data Repo Targets not required fo			
	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 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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 73%	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 64%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.576	140		123			72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No _____16180

RAPOPORT ACADEMY PUBLIC SCHOOL

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District

RAUL YZAGUIRRE SCHOOL FOR SUCCESS

County District No

Region

04

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	5A: 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	0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	1%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		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
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or			Baseline Data Repo Targets not required fo		J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	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 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
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 Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%	INO		1 1 2 3			72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

RAUL YZAGUIRRE SCHOOL FOR SUCCESS

04 101806

Region

County District No

District

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District **RAVEN SCHOOL**

Region

County District No

06

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	13%	NO	5A: 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	38%	NO	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class. separate school or				e Data Repor	·	
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool			<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	20%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	3070	30.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				070		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
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	236801
District	RAVEN SCHOOL	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

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

District	DAYMONDYII I E I
District	RAYMONDVILLE IS

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 63% 68% 67% NO 71% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 8% 10% 13% NO 18% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 3% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 98% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 98% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 56% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 55% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported

for children with disabilities

01 Region 245903 County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No

District RAYMONDVILLE ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No **REAGAN COUNTY ISD**

District

Region

18

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: 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	14%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
		3373				education class, separate school or 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 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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Durate	
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	65%	NO	demonstrate improved					numbers, o	small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.59/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Statement 1 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		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
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No
District	REAGAN COUNTY ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

Region 10 County District No 057841

RECONCILIATION 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	5A: 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	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
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		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 recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate so	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, o	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		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	, .	ot reported
4A: 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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
					demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev data are not reporte	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

Region County District No

RECONCILIATION ACADEMY

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	RED LICK IS

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

80 Region County District No 019911

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	,	
District	RED LICK ISD	

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District **RED OAK ISD**

Region

County District No

10

070911

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	80%	YES	5A: 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	8%	YES	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	16%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		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	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 98%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged of with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate so	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	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		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	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 63%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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 Diotnot 140	0.00
	_	
District	RED OAK ISD	

Region

County District No.

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

Dietrict	REDWATER IS
District	KEDWATER IS

80

019906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 72% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 9% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 98% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 69% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 47% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	019906
District	REDWATER ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

REFUGIO ISD

03

196903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 91% 68% 67% NO 80% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 9% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 4% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 70% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 62% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	196903
intrint	DEELIGIO ISD	

District REFUGIO ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

RESPONSIVE EDUCATION SOLUTIONS

County District No

Region

14

221801

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	5A: 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	33%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 98%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	YES Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	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 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: 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 70	0.570	140		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	rs to Summary	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No 2218
RESPONSIVE EDUCATION SOLUTIONS

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	02
County District No	137902

RICARDO 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	#NA	#NA	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	0070	0070	120	0070	120	education class, separate so residential facility.	chool or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	00 /6	00.076	123		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
4A: Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	55%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool	Summary					
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	Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	a school year for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate helpaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported					
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	13/302
· —	
RICARDO ISD	
	RICARDO ISD

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	RICE CISD	

03

045903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 72% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 6% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 4% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 97% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 59% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 54% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	045903
ct	DICE CISD	

Region

District

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	RICE ISD	

Region

County District No

12

175911

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	175911

Region

12

District RICE ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District

RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (AMARILLO)

County District No

Region

16

188801

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	65%	NO	5A: 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	25%	NO	5B : 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		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early.		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 88%	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate significant education class, separate so	lar early iving the a and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	Ü	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	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 33%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070	140		120		Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No 18880:

RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (AMARILLO)

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

Region 18 County District No 068801

RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (ECTOR COU 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	64%	NO	5A: Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	97%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	32%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading 95%	Reading YES		ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	·	
						residential facility.						
	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	26%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1		00.070			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
4A: Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	14%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool	Summany					
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		VEQ	YES children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%	INO		1 1 2 3		Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	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)

RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (ECTOR COU

Region County District No

District

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (FORT WORT District

Region County District No 220812

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	9%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	55%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receingaiority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	9	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 14%	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 0%	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		VEQ	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 70	0.3%	INO		IES		Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	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 RIC

County District No 220812

RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (FORT WORT

Region

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

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

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

District

RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (SUBURBAN

County District No

Region

04

101854

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	25%	NO	5A: 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	75%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	J	
						education class, separate school or residential facility.			1	<u> </u>	T	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool		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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /6	00.076	123		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				370		YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No _____101854
RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (SUBURBAN

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

RICHARD MILBURN ALTER HIGH SCHOOL District

Region 02 County District No 178804

				reuei	ai Fiscai Tea	ar 2011 (2011-12)	DIST	ici K	ICHARD IVIII	BURN ALTI	EK HIGH SC	HOOL
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	5A: 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	13%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	ū	
	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 86%	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 29%	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		VEQ	YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statem 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	0%	0.3%	INO		163		Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

RICHARD MILBURN ALTER HIGH SCHOOL

County District No

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

RICHARD MILBURN ALTER HIGH SCHOOL

County District No

Region

12

014801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO	5A: 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	18%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early		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 program; and (b) separate special				Data Report	J	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool		79%	81.2%	YES		small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	24%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1			_		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				373		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	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inveneans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No <u>01480</u>

RICHARD MILBURN ALTER HIGH SCHOOL

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	RICHARDS ISD	

06

093905

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 92% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 0% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 67% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 33% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	093905
District	RICHARDS ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	RICHARDSON ISE

10

057916

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 79% 68% 67% NO 69% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 8% 10% 13% NO 9% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 66% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 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 *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District NO _	U
	-	
riot	DICHADDOON ICD	

Region

County District No

District RICHARDSON ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District

RICHLAND COLLEGIATE HS OF MATH SCI

County District No

Region

10

057840

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

057840

District

RICHLAND COLLEGIATE HS OF MATH SCI

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

Region 15
County District No 206902

rict RICHLAND SPRINGS 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	5A: 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		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class. separate school or				Data Repor	J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 73%	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 36%	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	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.576	140		123		Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	RICHLAND SPRINGS ISD
District	MODILAND OF MINOGROUP

Region 15
County District No 206902

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	RIESEL ISD	

Region

County District No

12

161912

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 90% 68% 67% NO 87% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 7% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 69% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 57% YES 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 67% 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 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region	12
County District No	161912
•	

District RIESEL ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

Region 01 County District No

214901

RIO GRANDE CITY 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 I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	87%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early oprogram; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.			Ι	Ī		
	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	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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 not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	57%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool	Summon					
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1 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	070	0.3%	INO		I IES			72%	do			numbers, district level data are not reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District RIO GRANDE CITY CISD

Region

County District No

01

214901

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

one year of leaving high school.

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	RIO HONDO ISD

Region

County District No

01

031911

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 93% 68% 67% NO 87% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 7% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 11% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 58% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 63% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No

Region

District RIO HONDO ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No	126907
DIO MIOTA IOD	

Region

District **RIO VISTA 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		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	58%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul. childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seeducation 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 Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 47%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%	INO		169			72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district le data are not repor	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inveneans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No _	12690

District RIO VISTA ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	RISE ACADEMY	

Region

County District No

17

152802

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	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 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. 7A: Percent of preschool Summary				\(= 0		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	60 /6	00.076	ILS		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	93%	YES		Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No _	15

Region

District RISE ACADEMY

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	DIGING STAD ISD
District	RISING STAR ISD

14

067908

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 65% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 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 "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 5% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 85% 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 85% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	()ر	J	ווג	ιy	L	וכ	St	ПС	įι	ľ

District **RISING STAR ISD**

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District **RIVER ROAD ISD**

Region

County District No

16

188902

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	82%	YES	5A: 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	18%	NO	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 54%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 44%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	, .	ot reported
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	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No

inty District No 188902

Region

District RIVER ROAD ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	RIVERCREST ISD	

80

194903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 67% 68% 67% NO 52% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 33% 10% 13% NO 12% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 2% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 69% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 61% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	19490
atri at	DIVEDOBLETIED	

District RIVERCREST ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	RIVIERA ISD	

02

137903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 83% 68% 67% NO 89% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 17% NO 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 0% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 91% 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 91% 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 90% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math Math data are not reported Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 80% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	13/903
	·	
District	RIVIFRA ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District ROBERT LEE ISD

Region

County District No

15

041902

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	5A: 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	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	23%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	4%	NO	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate so	lar early iving the a and related childhood pecial		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.	<u> </u>			<u> </u>			
	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 level data are not reported		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	0070	00.070	120		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	data are n	data are not reported		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				0476		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	ear for children with demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summa.	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported							
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District i
District	ROBERT LEE ISD

Region **ROBERT LEE ISD**

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	ROBINSON ISD

12

161922

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	_	
District	ROBINSON ISD	

Region

County District No.

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	ROBSTOWN ISD
District	NODO I OWIN IOD

02

178909

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 53% 68% 67% NO 56% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 40% 10% 13% NO 9% YFS than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 49% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 47% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	178909
District	ROBSTOWN ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	ROBY CISD	

14

076903

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	076903
	_	
)istrict	ROBY CISD	

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	ROCHELLE ISD

15

160904

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 85% 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% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 58% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 33% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	160904
istrict	ROCHELLE ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	ROCKDALE ISD	

06

166904

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 78% 68% 67% NO 67% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 17% 10% 13% NO 10% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 48% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 45% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	000, 2.000	
District	ROCKDALE ISD	

Region

County District No.

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 069901 District **ROCKSPRINGS ISD**

Region

15

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	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate se	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 60%	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 67%	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	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	0.576	140		1123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	to Summary	72%	73.1%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities Statistical Parent Parent		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

District ROCKSPRINGS ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	ROCKWALL	ıer
District	RUCKWALL	191

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 76% 68% 67% NO 65% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 9% 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 NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 79% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 74% 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

10 Region 199901 County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No				
District	ROCKWALL ISD				

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	ROGERS ISD

12

014907

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	014907		
District	ROGERS ISD			

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	•	
District	ROMA ISD	

County District No

Region

01

214903

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 85% 68% 67% NO 73% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 4% 10% 13% NO 11% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 3% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 74% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 57% YES 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 76% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 72% YES 73.1% Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region	
County District No	214903

District ROMA ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

15 Region County District No 025910

	rmance Plan Indicator Targ ar 2011 (2011-12)	ets Disti		RON JACKS	ON STATE (CORR	
LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
#NA	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	0%	NO	
#NA	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
#NA	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
Reading #NA	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate scresidential facility.	ar early ving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor t required fo	Ū		
Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
#NA	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte		
Reading	7B: Percent of preschool							

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	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		#NA	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early	ng (a) regular early m and receiving the I education and related Baseline Data Reporting Year					
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			rargets no			
	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	#NA	#NA	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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		00.070	0		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				#NA	#NA	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	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	tho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

District RON JACKSON STATE JUVENILE CORR
COMPLEX UNIT I

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region 15 County District No 025911 RON JACKSON STATE JUVENILE CORR COMPLEX UNIT 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	5A: 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	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	#NA	#NA
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		#NA	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	#NA	#NA
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si	ar early iving the and related childhood	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	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	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	#NA	#NA	_	Statement 2	37 /6	30.7 %	TES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1 81% 82.7%		YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.576	140			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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)

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	ROOSEVELT ISD

17

152908

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 75% 68% 67% NO 67% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 8% 10% 11% NO 17% 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO YES 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 96% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 97% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 48% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 48% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County	DISTRICT IN

District **ROOSEVELT ISD**

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	ROPES ISD	

Region

County District No

17

110905

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	5A: 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	#NA	#NA	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seeducation class, separate so	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	early ig the id related Idhood 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		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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 83%	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 67%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	NO		ILS			72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	110905
etrict	ROPES ISD	

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	ROSCOE ISD

Region

County District No

14

177901

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 89% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 4% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 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 55% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	177901	
strict	POSCOE ISD		

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

etrict		

ROSEBUD-LOTT ISD

Region 12 County District No 073905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	92%	YES	5A: 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	8%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 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.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 68%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	52%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	INO		TES			72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

		C	οu	Int	y I	DIS	stri	CŢ	N	ļ

District **ROSEBUD-LOTT ISD**

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

strict	ROTAN ISD	

Region

County District No

14

076904

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 86% 68% 67% NO 74% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 14% 10% 13% NO 16% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 53% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 57% YES 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 47% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 72% YES 73.1% Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	076904
trict	ROTAN ISD	

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

tri at	DOLIND DOCK I
trict	ROUND ROCK I

Dist ISD

Region

County District No

13

246909

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	5A: 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	5%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate se	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.	T						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	75%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	60%	60.6%	TES		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	
44. 5	83%	59%	NO	71%	NO	70.0	Glatement 2						
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.59/	NO		VEC	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	school year for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summa	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported						
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District N
District	ROUND ROCK ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District **ROUND TOP-CARMINE ISD**

Region 13 County District No 075908

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	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B : 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		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si	lar early iving the and related childhood		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 89%	Reading YES	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	57%	58.7%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	68%	NO		Statement 2	57%	56.7%	162		
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		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.570	140		120	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

Region County District No

075908

strict ROUND TOP-CARMINE ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	ROXTON ISD	

80

139908

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 67% 68% 67% NO 87% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 7% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 88% NO education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 64% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 44% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	139908
strict	ROXTON ISD	

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	ROYAL ISD

04

237905

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 93% 68% 67% NO 61% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 17% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 47% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 51% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No _	237905
 DOYAL IOD	

Region

District ROYAL ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	ROYSE CITY ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 89% 68% 67% NO 64% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 8% 10% 13% NO 12% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 74% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 67% 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

10 Region County District No 199902

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	ROYSE CITY ISD

Region

199902

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

one year of leaving high school.

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	RULE ISD	

14

104903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 100% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 0% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 78% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 44% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region	14
County District No	104903

District RULE ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	RUNGE ISD

03

128903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 67% 68% 67% NO 100% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 0% 10% 11% NO 33% 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 55% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 27% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	128903
	DINCE ISD	
ct	DINGEIGN	

Region

District

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	RUSK ISD	

Region

County District No

07

037907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	94%	YES	5A: 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	6%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 52%	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 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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	U 76	0.3%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	03/90/	
District	RUSK ISD		

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Math

99%

Math

95%

Math

YES

Math

100%

of high school

subgroup

IEPs

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District S AND S CISD LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 83% 68% 67% NO 72% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 21% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 0% objectives for progress for disability placements 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES

> residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool

with IEPs who

children aged 3 through 5

demonstrate improved,

skills (including social

positive social-emotional

of appropriate behaviors to

education class, separate school or

79%

61%

72%

81.2%

62.1%

73.1%

YES

YES

YES

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

data are not reported

Summarv

Statement 1

Summarv

Statement 2

Summary

Statement 2

10

091914

Region

County District No

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 49% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 46% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 81% 82.7% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% 0.5% NO YES numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use

Math

YFS

					meet their needs	Oldlomoni 2				
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO	YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	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)

County District No	091914
0.4410.0.0100	

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District SABINAL ISD

Region

County District No

20

232902

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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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	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
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or			Baseline Data 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	79%	81.2%	YES			
	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
3C: 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	Due to small numbers, district I	
	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	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	0.576	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported				
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	
 0.4.0.14.1.100	

Region

District SABINAL ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	07
County District No	092906

SABINE 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	80%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	55%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	22%	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		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading 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 Rep Targets not required			
	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	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 55%	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 52%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
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	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	special education services w schools facilitated parent inv	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results		77%	YES	numbers, o	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 SARINE ISD	

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District SABINE PASS ISD

Region County District No 123913

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		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	85%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related				Data Repor	J	
	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,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	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 78%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	 numbers, district le data are not repor 	
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs 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: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 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	SABINE PASS ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

State

Target

75%

10%

100%

Reading

87%

21%

Reading

63%

NO

Reading

NO

Reading

69%

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating

2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out

3A: Percent of districts that have a disability

subgroup that meets the State's minimum

3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs

3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs

10 days in a school year of children with

IEPs by race and ethnicity

achievement standards

against grade level, modified, and alternate

"n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP

objectives for progress for disability

of high school

subgroup

from high school with a regular diploma

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

169911 County District No of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District SAINT JO ISD LEA State State **LEA Met** State **LEA** Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class YES YES 77% 100% 68% 67% NO 71% YES 80% or more of the day 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES YES 11% NO 10% 13% NO 6% than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -21, served in separate schools, residential

Summarv

Statement 1

1%

80%

1%

80.8%

YES

YES

0%

YES

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

09

Region

6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or

7B: Percent of preschool

children aged 3 through 5

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

demonstrate improved

with IEPs who

residential facility.

facilities, or homebound/hospital

placements

7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships)

Reading

NO

	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 46%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are not reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	NO		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	data are not reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	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	Due to small numbers, 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)

	County District No _	169911	
intrint	CAINT IO ICD		

Region

istrict SAINT JO IS

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	SALADO ISD

Region

County District No

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	86%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 82%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 78%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 70	0.3%	NO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	special education services w schools facilitated parent inv	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results		77%	YES	numbers, o	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	SALADO ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SALTILLO IS

80

112909

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 84% 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% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 58% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 54% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	
 041 711 1 0 100	

Region

District SALTILLO ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	CAM DAVDUDNUC
District	SAM RAYBURN IS

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

10 Region 074917 County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No _	07
 0.444.0.47.011.01.100	

Region

District SAM RAYBURN ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SAMNORWOOD ISD

16

044904

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

		C	C	u	n	ty	۱ ۱	ט	IS	tri	IC	t	N)

Region

District SAMNORWOOD ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District **SAN ANGELO ISD**

Region 15 County District No 226903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators			State Met 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		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	76%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	15%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day			NO	11%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1			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	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 66%	Reading NO	7B: 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	64%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary 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	00/	0.50/	NO		VEC	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 numbers data are		ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No 226903

District SAN ANGELO ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

SAN ANTONIO CAN HIGH SCHOOL

County District No

Region

20

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	79%	YES	5A: 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	14%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report t required for	Ū	
						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		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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	38%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1		00.070			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
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INU		1 1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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

County District No ____01
SAN ANTONIO CAN HIGH SCHOOL

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

one year of leaving high school.

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region 20 County District No 015907

District SAN ANTONIO 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	77%	YES	5A: 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	16%	NO	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 49%	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 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	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 /6	0.576	NO		ILS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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 SAN ANTONIO ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District SAN ANTONIO SCHOOL FOR INQUIRY & C

Region County District No 015820

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	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	·	
						residential facility.			T	Ī	T	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	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
4A: Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	57%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	0.50/	NO		\/F0	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No ____01582
SAN ANTONIO SCHOOL FOR INQUIRY & C

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

SAN ANTONIO TECHNOLOGY ACADEMY

County District No

Region

20

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early	lar early iving the and related			Data Repor	J	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			rargets no	t required fo	FFF 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	33%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80 %	80.676	123		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
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				07%		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
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No

Region

SAN ANTONIO TECHNOLOGY ACADEMY

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	CAN ALICHETINE ICE
District	SAN AUGUSTINE ISD

07

203901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 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% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 35% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 33% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	000, 2.000
District	SAN AUGUSTINE ISD

Region

County District No.

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	SAN BENITO CISD

Region

County District No

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?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	78%	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	59%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	14%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading 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. 7A: Percent of preschool		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	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	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	56%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 70	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	83%			57%		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
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

strict	SAN BENITO CISD

Dis

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers level dat	,
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	,
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	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/.

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

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

District	SAN DIEGO ISD

02

066902

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SAN DIEGO ISD	

Region

County District No.

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

SAN ELIZARIO ISD

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met 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	5A: 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		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	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		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Reporting Ye					•	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential 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			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	0070	00.070	120		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			_				
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		VEC	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		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District SAN ELIZARIO ISD

Region 19 County District No 071904

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO CISD

County District No

Region

15

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

SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO CISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	SAN ISIDRO ISD
District	CAN IDIDICO IDD

Region

County District No

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?		
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	39%	NO		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood			Baseline Data Reporting Year					
	95% 99% YES 93% NO program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool summary special education class, separate school or residential facility.		pecial	Targets not required for FFY 2011										
			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		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 77%	Reading NO	children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported			
	83%	59%	NO	64%	NO	Tanana aga ana ana								
4A: 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		0.5%	NO		YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level		
		0.576	140				Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev data are not reporte			

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

9	
County District No	2

Region

District SAN ISIDRO ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

SAN MARCOS CISD District

Region County District No 105902

13

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	58%	NO	5A: 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	16%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receingiority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summary							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES			
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	60%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1		00.070	0		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	
4A: 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	00/	0.50/	NO		VEC	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	ool year for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate helpaviors to Summ	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported						
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	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

District SAN MARCOS CISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SAN PERLITA ISI

Region

County District No

01

245904

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 85% 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% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 64% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

triot	CAN DEDITATED

Region

County District No.

District SAN PERLITA ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	SAN SABA ISD

Region

County District No

15

206901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: 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		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	10%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	h Math Statement 1 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 40%	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 38%	Math NO	h acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary		57%	58.7%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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	days in a school year for children with demo	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported						
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

	_	
etrict	SAN SARA ISD	

Region

County District No.

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

B1 1 1 1	
District	SAN VICENTE ISI

County District No

Region

18

022903

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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	#NA	#NA	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	#NA	#NA	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 0%	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 0%	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	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	demonstrate improved use of appropriate helaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported						
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No 022903

District SAN VICENTE ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SANDS CISD
DISTRICT	SANDS CISD

17

058909

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 83% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 0% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 93% NO education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 93% 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 71% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 71% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	058909
-1	OANDO OIOD	

Region

District SANDS CISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SANFORD-FRITCH IS

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 48% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 9% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 53% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 41% 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

16 Region 117903 County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No
District	SANFORD-FRITCH ISD

Region

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

one year of leaving high school.

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	11
County District No	061908

SANGER 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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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	9%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	·	
						residential facility.	ducation class, separate school or esidential 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	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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 %	80.878	TES		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	60%	NO		Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		\/F0	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	061908
CANCEDIED	

District SANGER IS

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	SANTA ANNA ISD
District	

Region 15 County District No 042903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	75%	YES	5A: 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	0%	YES	5B: 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		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Re						•	0	
	95%	99%	YES	91%	NO	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	91%	NO	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	000/	00.00/	V50		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	60%	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	37 /6	30.7 /6	11.5		
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	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	J 70	0.076	140			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District N

District SANTA ANNA ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

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

District	CANTA EE IOD
District	SANTA FE ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 78% 68% 67% NO 86% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 8% 10% 11% NO 11% 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital #NA objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 71% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 64% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported

for children with disabilities

04 Region 084909 County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No
District	SANTA FE ISD

Region

SANTA FE ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

Region 02
County District No 137904

trict SANTA GERTRUDIS 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	100%	YES	5A: 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		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate se		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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 56%	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 22%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.576	140		123	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	SANTA GERTRUDIS

County District No **SANTA GERTRUDIS ISD**

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District ___ SANTA MARIA ISD

Region

County District No

01

031913

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	5A: 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		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	5%	YES			
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES			
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				•	a Reporting Year uired 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 level data are not reported				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES					
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	00.00/	YES					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		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	0170	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 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level				
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.570	140					72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported			

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	(
District	SANTA MARIA ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	SANTA ROSA ISD

Region

County District No

01

031914

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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 lev data are not reporte	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 60%	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 69%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	INO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	SANTA ROSA ISD	

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County	/ District ino _	182904
	_	

Region

SANTO 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	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	87%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoof facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate school or residential facility.							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	numbers, district lev data are not reporte		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	63%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 71%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				7 1 76		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	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	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	102904
District	SANTO ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SAVOY ISD

10

074911

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 67% 68% 67% NO 70% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 33% 10% 13% NO 3% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 65% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 46% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	074911
0.41/01/100	

Region

District SAVOY ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

County District No

Region

20 094902

SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U 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	80%	YES	5A: 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	4%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report	J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 72%	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 64%	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	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	0,0	0.070			. =0	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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

20)94902

ict SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U CITY ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SCHLEICHER ISD

15

207901

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District NO _	20/901
istrict	SCHLEICHER ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District

SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

County District No

Region

20

015806

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	5A: Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	94%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		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		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate seeducation class, s	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool					T			
	Math Math Math Math Math Children aged 3 through 5 Statement Summan 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 le data are not report			
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES				
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	52%	NO	with IEPs who Statement 1 demonstrate improved		00.070			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		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				33%		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% 0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES			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 _____01580
SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

County District No

Region

20

015827

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	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	97%	YES			
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES			
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES			
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading 92%	Reading NO	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	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 Statement State	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		small								
	95%	99%	YES	92%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report				
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	70%	NO	with IEPs who Statement 1 demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		small district level			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported			
	83%	59%	NO	61%	NO		Statement 2								
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	0.50/			\/F0	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small			
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO	NO YES	YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district data are not repo				
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported			

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

County District No

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	
----------	--

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	5A: 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	#NA	#NA	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate scresidential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	•	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2% YES Due to sma			
	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	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 73%	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 87%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summ	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· ·	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0.5%	NO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Sumr	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent 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

	SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLO
District	CORPUS CHRISTI

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No 015831 SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DISCOVERY

20

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	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate so residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	•	
	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 smanumbers, district			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	data are not reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 64%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Sumi	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.59/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to sma	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		1 1 2	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summa	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans 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)

Region 20
County District No 015831
SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

District DISCOVERY

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SCHIII ENDIIDO ISI
District	SCHULENBURG ISI

13

075903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 46% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 16% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 61% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 47% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _
District	SCHULENBURG ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

IEPs

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

0%

0.7%

NO

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

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

District **SCURRY-ROSSER ISD** 10

129910

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 92% 68% 67% NO 62% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 12% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 96% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 65% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 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

Summarv

Statement 2

72%

76%

73.1%

77%

YES

YES

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

meet their needs

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 **SCURRY-ROSSER ISD**

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SEAGRAVES ISD

Region

County District No

17

083901

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 51% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 50% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 43% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No
District	SEAGRAVES ISD

Region

reported

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

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SEALY ISD	

06

008902

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 96% 68% 67% NO 73% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 11% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 67% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 57% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	000902
	-	
strict	SEALY ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District

SEASHORE CHARTER SCHOOLS

County District No

Region

02

178808

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No ____1
SEASHORE CHARTER SCHOOLS

Region

178808

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	13
County District No	094901

SEGUIN 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 Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	94%	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	74%	YES			
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	16%	NO			
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES			
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		ling with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special With IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special Baseline Data Reporting Targets not required for FF					. •		
									1	I	T				
	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	numbers, district leve data are not reported				
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	00 /6	00.076	123		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	data are n	ot reported			
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				1070		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small			
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported			

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	094901	
ict	SECHINISD		

District

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

SEMINOLE ISD District

Region County District No 083903

17

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	71%	NO		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	53%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	11%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				•	Reporting Year red for FFY 2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report		
3C: 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 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	
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	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	INO		ILS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	special education services w schools facilitated parent inv	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results		77%	YES	numbers, o	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	
a t	CEMINOL E ICD	

Region

District SEMINOLE ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

SER-NINOS CHARTER SCHOOL

Region 04 County District No 101802

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	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				
	9576	9976	123	100 /8	123	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	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	69%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		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	data are n	ot reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	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

SER-NINOS CHARTER SCHOOL

County District No

Region

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

one year of leaving high school.

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SEYMOUR ISD

09

012901

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	012901	
District	SEYMOUR ISD		

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	CHALLOWATED IS
District	SHALLOWATER IS

17

152909

Region County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met 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	73%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	12%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 78%	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 73%	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	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	r for children with 0.5% 1.5% 1.00 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summai	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported					
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	

Region

District SHALLOWATER ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	242902

Region

16

District SHAMROCK 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	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	#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	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		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		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	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
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	,	district level ot reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o 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	24

Region

District SHAMROCK ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SHARYLAND ISD

Region

County District No

01

108911

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 80% 68% 67% NO 72% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 7% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 2% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 72% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 74% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	108911
District	SHARYI AND ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

SHEKINAH RADIANCE ACADEMY

County District No

Region

20

015819

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	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	98%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regulachildhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood			Data Repor	Ü	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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	 numbers, district le data are not reporte 	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 62%	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	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	46%	NO	5	Statement 2	57%	56.7%	169		
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	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.570	140			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level 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

SHEKINAH RADIANCE ACADEMY

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

SHELBYVILLE ISD

County District No

Region

07 210903

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	5A: 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	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receivajority of special education services in the regular early of special education services in the regular education services in the regular education services in the services in the regular education service	ar early iving the and related childhood			Data Repor	Ü	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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 district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 68%	Reading NO	7B: 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	55%	NO	knowledge and skills	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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%	0.5%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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

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

County District No District

SHELBYVILLE ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	04
County District No	1019

District _ SHELDON 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	85%	YES	5A: 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	12%	NO	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Repor	•	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	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	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 72%	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 67%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	umbers, district leve data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	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	070	0.3%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	101924
atriot	CHEL DON ICD	

Region

District SHELDON IS

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SHEPHERD ISD	

06

204904

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 74% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 5% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 58% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No			
District	SHEPHERD ISD			

SHEPHERD ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SHERMAN ISD

10

091906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 87% YES 75% 77% YES 68% 67% NO 57% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 98% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 55% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	091906
)istrict	SHERMANISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SHINER ISD

03

143903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 35% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 4% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 4% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 56% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 56% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	143903
intriot	CHINED ICD	

Region

SHINER ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	•	
District	SIDNEY ISD	

County District No

Region

14

047905

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 0% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 50% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 25% 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 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	047905
triot	SIDNEY ISD	

Region

District SIDNEY ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District ___ SIERRA BLANCA ISD

County District No 115902

Region

19

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	5A: 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	0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – class less	10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential 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 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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 88%	Reading YES	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 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	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 70	0.070	INU		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County	District	No

District SIERRA BLANCA ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SILSBEE ISD

05

100904

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 81% 68% 67% NO 62% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 13% 10% 13% NO 19% NO than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 45% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 46% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	100904
tri at	CII CREE ICD	-

District SILSBEE ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	SILVERTON ISD
District	OIL V LIX I OI V IOD

Region

County District No

16

023902

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	5A: 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	#NA	#NA	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		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		
3C: 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		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 42%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported			
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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	U 76	0.3%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		of appropriate behaviors to Summary		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inveneans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SILVERTON ISD	

Region

County District No.

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SIMMS ISD	

80

019909

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 77% 68% 67% NO 63% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 12% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 37% 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 41% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 81% 82.7% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	019909
District	SIMMS ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SINTON ISD	

02

205906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 82% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 8% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 53% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 47% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	205906
istrict	SINTON ISD	

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

County District No

SIVELLS BEND ISD

Region

11

049909

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: 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	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		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		g with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Base				Data Repor	J	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				raigets no	ic required to				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	80%	00.0%	163		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	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				10078		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		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported		

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District SIVELLS BEND ISD

Region 11 049909 County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	SKIDMORE-TYNAN ISD

Region

County District No

02

013905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: 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	0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	6%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Report					J	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				Targets no	t required fo				
	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		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 74%	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 64%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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	U%	0.5%	INU		1 1 2	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

	'	U	unit	y L	713	ui	Οι	1 1	U

District SKIDMORE-TYNAN ISD

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SLATON ISD

17

152903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 68% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 15% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 54% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 38% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	152903

Region

17

District SLATON ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	SLIDELL ISD

Region

County District No

11

249908

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: 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	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	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special with IEPs attending (a) regular early the majority of special Baseline Data Reporting Yea Targets not required for FFY 20				ŭ	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 89%	Reading YES	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 67%	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	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	U70	0.5%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	249908
District	SLIDELL ISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SLOCUM ISD
District	SECCON ISD

07

001909

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	001909
triot	SI OCHWISD	

Region

District SLOCUM IS

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District ____ SMITHVILLE ISD

Region

County District No

13

011904

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	5A: 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	50%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading 98%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seeducation class, separate se	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 51%	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 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	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 70	0.576	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	SMITHVILLE ISD

SMITHVILLE ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SMYER ISD	

17

110906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 89% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 0% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 55% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 45% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	110906
etrict	SWAED ISD	

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SNOOK ISD	

06

026903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State **LEA** Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 67% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 4% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 2% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 62% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 38% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	020303
	-	
District	SNOOK ISD	

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SNYDER ISD

14

208902

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 97% YES 75% 77% YES 68% 67% NO 80% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 6% YFS than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 98% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 46% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 46% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	208902
0111/DED 10D	

District SNYDER ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SOCORRO ISD

19

071909

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 69% 68% 67% NO 65% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 7% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 17% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 67% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 64% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	07 ⁻
2.4	00000000100	

Region

District SOCORRO ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

SOMERSET CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

County District No

19

071808

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	#NA	#NA		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		#NA	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	#NA	#NA		
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		ng with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Reporting					ū	
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate so residential facility.		Targets no	t 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	#NA	#NA	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 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	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 #NA	Math #NA	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported			
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	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%	0.5%	INO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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 ______
SOMERSET CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

071808

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District ___ SOMERSET ISD

Region

County District No

20

015909

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO	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	19%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool		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 Years Targets not required for FFY 2			-	
									<u> </u>		Τ	
	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	56%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	58%	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	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	070	0.5%	INO		I IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

		0.00
District	SOMERSET ISD	

Region

County District No.

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District ___ SOMERVILLE ISD

Region

County District No

06

026902

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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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	0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – class less	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		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential 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 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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 34%	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 29%	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	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 /0	0.576	140		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District N

District SOMERVILLE ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SONORA ISD

15

218901

Region

County District No

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	218901
4	CONODA ICD	

District SONORA IS

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

5 1	
District	SOUTH PLAINS

17

152803

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?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	81%	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	96%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 201				·	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES								
	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		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	0070	00.070	120		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	data are not reporte		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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 _	1
 001171171 41110	

Region

District SOUTH PLAINS

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

Region 20 County District No 015908

District

SOUTH SAN ANTONIO 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	59%	NO	5A: 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	26%	NO	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	lar early iving the a and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: 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 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	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 /0	0.576	INO		ILS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		NO	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District SOUTH SAN ANTONIO ISD

Region 20 County District No 015908

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region 01
County District No 108802
SOUTH TEXAS EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGIES
INC

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	5A: 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	#NA	#NA	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	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				•	ū	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				raigets no	it required for	TFT 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		
3C: 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 63%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		\/F0	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		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	tho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

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

Region 01
County District No 108802
SOUTH TEXAS EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGIES

District INC

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SOUTH TEXAS ISI

Region

County District No

01

031916

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 96% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 0% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 4% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 95% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 48% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 33% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No
District	SOUTH TEXAS ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

trict	SOUTHLAND ISD

District _____

Region

County District No

17

085903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	23%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood 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 20			J	
	9376	9976	123	10076	TEG							
	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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		00.070	120		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 44%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No
District	SOUTHLAND ISD

Region 17
County District No 085903

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	SOUTHSIDE IS

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 75% 68% 67% NO 57% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 16% 10% 13% NO 17% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 98% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 50% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 45% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

20 Region 015917 County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	0139
	-	
trict	SUITHSIDE ISD	

Region

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

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

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

District	SOUTHWEST IS

20

015912

data are not reported

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 77% 68% 67% NO 85% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 16% 10% 13% NO 10% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 56% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 49% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No

District SOUTHWEST ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

SOUTHWEST PREPARATORY SCHOOL

County District No

Region

20

015807

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	39%	NO		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	96%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	42%	NO	5B : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 14%	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	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	8%	NO	Ü	Statement 2	57%	36.7%	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		Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	YES Due to small numbers, district le	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.570	140	of appropriate hehaviors to Summa	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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 ____0158
SOUTHWEST PREPARATORY SCHOOL

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

County District No	101838

Region

04

SOUTHWEST 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 Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	48%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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	43%	NO	5B : 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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	3070	3370	120	10070	120	education class, separate so residential facility.							
	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 level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	53%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /0	00.076	123		o small district level	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	43%	NO		Statement 2						
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		VEC	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		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	101
District	SOUTHWEST SCHOOL	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		NO
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SPEARMAN ISD	

16

098904

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 73% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 5% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 97% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 59% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 62% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SPEARMAN ISD	

Region

reported

County District No.

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES inappropriate identification 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or. they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not

education or training program: or competitively

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/.

significant discrepancy in the rate of

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

IEPs

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

10 days in a school year for children with

0%

0%

0.5%

0.7%

NO

NO

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SPLENDORA ISD

82.7%

73.1%

77%

YES

YES

YES

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

81%

72%

76%

06

170907

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 89% 68% 67% NO 77% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 11% 10% 13% NO 13% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 58% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 63% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool

Summary

Statement 1

Summarv

Statement 2

children aged 3 through 5

demonstrate improved use

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

with IEPs who

meet their needs

YES

YES

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	1709
etrict	SDI ENDODA ISD	

Region

istrict SPLENDORA ISI

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SPRING BRANCH ISD
District	SPRING BRANCH ISD

Region

County District No

04

101920

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	73%	NO	5A: 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	11%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	·	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	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 61%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	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	0 70	0.576	140		120		Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	

Region

District SPRING BRANCH ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	YES 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

SPRING CREEK ISD District

Region 16 County District No 117907

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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	5A: 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		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	ŭ	
									 	T		
	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	,	not reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading	Reading YES	7B: 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	0				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level not reported
	83%	59%	NO	80%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.59/	NO		VES	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
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES		Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

County District N

District **SPRING CREEK ISD**

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SPRING HILL ISD
DISTRICT	SEKING HILL ISD

Region

County District No

07

092907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	83%	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	53%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	17%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		pecial						
	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	Due to small numbers, district leve		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES		Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are not repo		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 79%	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 58%	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 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
		0.5%	INU				Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district data are not repo		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	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)

	County District No
District	SPRING HILL ISD

Region

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES inappropriate identification of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SPRING ISD

04

101919

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 62% 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 NO 10% 11% NO 21% 10% 13% NO 17% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 58% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 49% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	101919
:	CDDING ICD	

Region

District SPRING ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

SPRINGLAKE-EARTH ISD District

Region 17 County District No 140907

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	5A: Percent of children with a 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	0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		EPs attending (a) regular early lood program and receiving the itiy of special education and related less in the regular early childhood lam; and (b) separate special Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
									T	Ī	T	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	0070	00.070	120		small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	54%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	C: 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		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	NO					72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region

County District No

SPRINGLAKE-EARTH ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SPRINGTOWN ISD

Region

County District No

11

184902

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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	89%	YES	5A: 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	4%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	19%	NO		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	ŭ			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		Due to small numbers, 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		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 54%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	NO		ILS			72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invineans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No _	1849
 OPPINIOTOWN IOP	

District SPRINGTOWN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SPUR ISD	

Region

County District No

17

063903

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	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				e Data Repor	orting Year 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		district level ot reported		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 60%	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		
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	INO		IES			72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	063903

Region

17

District SPUR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

SPURGER ISD District

Region County District No 229905

05

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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	72%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B: 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		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Reporting						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.	pecial		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,	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 48%	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	F70/	E0 70/	YES		district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	43%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statemen with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	20 a. i., 2 io i. io i	
District	SPURGER ISD	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	ST ANTHONY	SCHOO
DISTRICT	SI ANIHUNI	э споо

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 90% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 71% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

10 Region 057836 County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	ST ANTHONY 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?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	ON	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 013801 ST MARY'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

02

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	5A: 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	#NA	#NA	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood passeline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	95%	99%	TES	100%	TES	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		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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	00%	00.0%	163		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
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than					YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No ____013801
ST MARY'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	STAFFORD MSD

04

079910

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 76% 68% 67% NO 52% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 18% 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 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 63% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 54% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	0199
trict	STAFFORD MSD	

Region

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	STAMFORD ISD	

14

127906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 93% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 3% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 2% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 98% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 56% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 52% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	127906
istrict	STAMFORD ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	STANTON ISD

18

156902

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 83% 68% 67% NO 66% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 17% NO 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 2% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 63% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 53% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	156902
atriat	CTANTON ICD	

District STANTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District ___ STAR CHARTER SCHOOL

Region 13 County District No 227814

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	5A: 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	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
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		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 Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	95%	99%	163	100%	TES	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	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	57%	58.7%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	100%	YES		Statement 2	37 70	30.776	123		
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	070	0.070	110		120	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District STAR CHARTER SCHOOL

Region 13
County District No 227814

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	12
County District No	167903

STAR 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	67%	NO	5A: 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	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
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		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 Childhood program and receiving the majority of special Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	3070	0070	120	10070	120	education class, separate so residential facility.	education class, separate school or residential facility.					
	Math	Math	n Math Math Math Statement 1 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	33%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /6	00.076	123		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
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of	83%	59%	NO	67%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	o small
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		72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, o	district level ot reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	167903
CTAD ICD	

Region

12

District STAR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to s	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 07
County District No 174801
STEPHEN F AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY
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 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	5A: 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	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
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to smanumbers, distric	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, 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 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	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 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.59/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	YES numbers, dis data are not	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 07
County District No 174801

STEPHEN F AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY 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?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	STEPHENVILLE	

Region

County District No

11

072903

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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				•	Data Reporting Year required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev			
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 70%	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	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	U70	0.5%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	072903
District	STEPHENVILLE	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

STEPPING STONES CHARTER EL

County District No

Region

04

101859

mp.//www.tea.state.tx.us/s	pcolal.ca/			Feder	al Fiscal Ye	ar 2011 (2011-12)	Dist	rict	STEPPIN	IG STONES	CHARTER E	EL .
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		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	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
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	ŭ	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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 district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	53%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement					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
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				33,3		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
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receil special education services who report schools facilitated parent involvement ameans of improving services and result 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 ____1
STEPPING STONES CHARTER EL

Region

101859

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	econdary school, had IEPs in effect at the time ney left school, and were enrolled in higher 24% 22% NO		NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	STERLING CITY

15

216901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 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 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 100% 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 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 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No
District	STERLING CITY ISD

Region

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES 0% 0% YES assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% NO YES inappropriate identification of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 10: Percent of districts with 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time disproportionate representation of racial numbers, district 0% 0% YES YES 24% 22% NO and ethnic groups in specific disability they left school, and were enrolled in higher level data are not categories that is the result of education within one year of leaving high school. reported inappropriate identification 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.8% NO YES 56% 57% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not within which the evaluation must be vear of leaving high school reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B. and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.1% NO YFS education or in some other postsecondary 71% 69% NO level data are not education or training program: or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District STOCKDALE ISD

Region

County District No

20

247906

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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	58%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	19%	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		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 43%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summary With IEPs who demonstrate improved		80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev		
	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	
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 Statemen with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

	(اب	Ol	J١	ηty	'	כ	IST	rı	CŢ	N

Region

District STOCKDALE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District STRATFORD ISD

Region

County District No

16

211902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	33%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	0070	30% 120		10070	, 20	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	80% 80.8%	80.8%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	
	87%	63%	NO	50%	NO		Statement 1	00 70	33.070			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math		Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%			
	83%	59%	NO	68%	NO		Statement 2					
4A: 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	the rate of	0.50/	NO		\(\(\)	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to sma	
	0%	0.5%	NO		YES		Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District STRATFORD ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	11
County District No	182905

STRAWN 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	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	70%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 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	·	
		0070	120	10070	120							
	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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 70	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
4A: Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool	0					
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.59/	NO		YES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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 _	182905
District	STRAWN ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SUDAN ISD	

Region

County District No

17

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 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	ŭ	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		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 leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 61%	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 55%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	140908
CHDANIED	

Region

17

District SUDAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **SULPHUR BLUFF ISD**

Region

County District No

80

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	5A: 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	0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 20		J		
	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	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	
3C: 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 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
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	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No	
_		

Region

District SULPHUR BLUFF ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **SULPHUR SPRINGS ISD**

Region

County District No

80

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	88%	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	12%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	14%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C : Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						education class, separate sc residential facility.	nooi 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
	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	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: 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	00 /6	00.078	123		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 44%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				,	V50	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
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District SULPHUR SPRINGS ISD

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SUNDOWN ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 94% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 0% 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 96% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 89% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

17 Region 110907 County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

	County District No _	110907	
intriot	STINDOWN ISD		

strict SUNDOWN IS

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SUNNYVALE ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class 75% 77% YES #NA #NA 68% 67% NO 82% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 8% 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 95% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math Math data are not reported Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 86% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Region 10
County District No 057919

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	SUNNYVALE ISD

SUNNYVALE ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SUNRAY ISD	

16

171902

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 58% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 3% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 3% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 56% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 56% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	17 1302
-	
SUNRAY ISD	
	SUNRAY ISD

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SWEENY ISD	

04

020906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 73% 68% 67% NO 80% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 18% 10% 13% NO 12% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 63% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 57% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	020906
SWEENVISD	

District SWEENY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SWEET HO
Diotriot	• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

County District No 143905 OME ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si	lar early iving the and related childhood			seline Data Reporting Year ets not required for FFY 2011			
	95%	99%	163	100%	123	education class, separate so residential facility.	chool or						
	with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small							
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	VEC			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /6	80.8%	YES		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 not reported		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than					YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	YES Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
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			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SWEET HOME ISD

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	s small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

83%

0%

0%

4A: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

IEPs

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

10 days in a school year for children with

59%

0.5%

0.7%

NO

NO

NO

47%

NO

YES

YES

7C: Percent of preschool

children aged 3 through 5

demonstrate improved use

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

with IEPs who

meet their needs

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	SWEETWATER ISI
District	SWEETWATER ISI

57%

81%

72%

76%

Statement 2

Summary

Statement 1

Summarv

Statement 2

58.7%

82.7%

73.1%

77%

YES

YES

YES

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Region

County District No

14

177902

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 72% 68% 67% NO 68% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 17% 10% 13% NO 6% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 48% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	17
District	SWEETWATER ISD	

SWEETWATER ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.