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	TAFT ISD	

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 74% 68% 67% NO 79% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 16% 10% 13% NO 10% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 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 94% NO education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 95% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 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 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

for children with disabilities

02 205907

Region

County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	205907
istrict	TAFT 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 of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District	TAHOKA ISD

17

153904

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 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% 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 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	1539
.:	TALLOKA ICD	

District TAHOKA 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 TARKINGTON ISD

Region

County District No

04

146907

State 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	66%	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	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	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	J	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES			program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or			111 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
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	80 %	80.676	123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	56%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	children aged 3 through 5 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 78	0.576	NO		ILS	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 invi 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 Biothor No	1.00
District	TARKINGTON 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	TATUM ISD	

07

201910

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 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 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% 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 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	201910
TATURALOD	

Region

District TATUM 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/.

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	TAYLOR ISD
DISTRICT	IAILUK ISD

77%

76%

YES

13

246911

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 84% 68% 67% NO 59% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 13% 10% 13% NO 12% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 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 57% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 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

YES

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	· -	
District	TAYLOR ISD	

Region

County District No.

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

		·
ct	TEAGUE ISD	

Region

County District No

12

081904

District _____ TEAGUE 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	48%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	20%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO	
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	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 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					ta Reporting Year quired for FFY 2011		
	3370	3370	120	10070	120	education class, separate so residential facility.	thool or						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
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	0070	00.070	120		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3370		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	081904
District	TEAGUE 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.		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)

05 Region County District No 123803 TEKOA ACADEMY OF ACCELERATED STUDIES STEM 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 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	95%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#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 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	J	
	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 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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 47%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0.5%	NO		1 1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	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	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 05
County District No 123803

TEKOA ACADEMY OF ACCELERATED STUDIES
STEM 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.	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%	57% YES Due to small numbers, district level data are not 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.	the time her numbers, distributely NO Properties of the time her numbers, distributely NO Properties of the time numbers and the time numbers are the time numbers.		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 ___

Region 12 County District No 014803

TEMPLE EDUCATION CENTER

State 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	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		*	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 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				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	,	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 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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
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	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 _____
TEMPLE EDUCATION CENTER

Region

12 014803

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

12

014909

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	014303	
District	TEMPLE ISD		

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	TENAHA ISD	

07

210904

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 45% 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 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 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 33% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 37% 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 _	210904
TENALA ICD	

Region

District TENAHA 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	s appropriate measurable at are annually updated appropriate transition services, including courses anally enable the student to any goals, and annual IEP lent's transition services		YES		
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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	TERLINGUA CSD

18

022004

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 50% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 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

if the State establishes a timeframe

within which the evaluation must be

12: Percent of children referred by Part C

prior to age 3, who are found eligible for

Part B. and who have an IEP developed

and implemented by their third birthdays

conducted, within that timeframe

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education 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	TERLINGUA CSD

Region 18 hty District No 022004

level data are not

reported

Due to small

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

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

education or competitively employed within one

secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time

71%

69%

NO

14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

education or in some other postsecondary

one year of leaving high school.

vear of leaving high school

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

100%

99.1%

NO

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

YFS

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

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

riot TE				
	=	· т	TI	rict

Region 18 County District No 222901

Distr ERRELL COUNTY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	20%	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	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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si	ending (a) regular early ogram and receiving the pecial education and related e regular early childhood		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, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			61%	62.1%	YES			
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			80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	67%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	00.070	120	Due to small numbers, district leve		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	Math NO	Knowledge and Skills Summary 57		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	00/	0.50/	NO		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 81% YES 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	YES numbers, district leve			
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	TERRELL COUNTY ISD

Region 18 nty District No 222901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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	TERRELL ISD

10

129906

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 70% 68% 67% NO 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 12% NO 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 20% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 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 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	129906
TERRELL ICR	

Region

District TERRELL 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	TEXARKANA ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 85% 68% 67% NO 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 YES 10% 11% NO 10% 10% 13% NO 20% NO than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 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 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 40% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Region 08
County District No 019907

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	UIS
riot	TEVADIZAMA ICD	

Region

County District No

District TEXARKANA 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	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	05
County District No	123503
TEXAS ACADEMY OF LEADERSHI	P IN THE
HIMANITIES	

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	#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		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 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.				ting Year		
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA				rargets no	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	#NA	#NA	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 #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		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
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)

Region 05
County District No 123503

TEXAS ACADEMY OF LEADERSHIP IN THE District HUMANITIES

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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/.

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma

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

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

objectives for progress for disability

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

of high school

subgroup

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

LEA

Met

State

Target?

YES

NO

NO

Reading

YFS

Math

YES

80% or more of the day

than 40% of the day

placements

residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool

with IEPs who

meet their needs

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

children aged 3 through 5

5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -

21, served in separate schools, residential

facilities, or homebound/hospital

education class, separate school or

State

Met

Target?

YES

NO

NO

Reading

YES

Math

NO

LEA

Rate

76%

14%

Reading

100%

Math

State

Rate

77%

11%

21%

Reading

99%

Math

0.7%

State

Target

75%

10%

100%

Reading

95%

Math

0%

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

Region 084906 County District No District **TEXAS CITY ISD** State **LEA Met** LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 68% 67% NO 77% YES 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -21, served inside the regular class less 10% 13% NO 8% YES

YES

YES

YES

04

YES

Due to small

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

#NA

6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early 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

79%

76%

Summarv

Statement 1

1%

1%

81.2%

77%

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 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 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	
 TEV 4.0. OITV 10.D	

Region

District TEXAS 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 Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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	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 220814

TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF THE ARTS 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	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			
	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 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 75%	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	140		125	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

220814

Region

District TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF THE ARTS

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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 71% 69% No education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

TEXAS EMPOWERMENT ACADEMY

County District No

Region

13

227805

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	91%	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			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			9	1		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	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 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	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	570/	50 70/	\/50	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	47%	NO	euge and online	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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	0.5%	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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

Region County District No

TEXAS EMPOWERMENT 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	TEXAS LEADERSHIP

Region 15 County District No 226801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	75%	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	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/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				Data Repor	·		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			rargets no	r required for	unod 101 1 1 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 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	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				,	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO	momougo ana samo	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	U 70	0.3%	INO		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	TEXAS LEADERSHIP

Region 15 County District No 226801

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%	ON	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		57%	YES	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

TEXAS PREPARATORY SCHOOL

Region 13
County District No 105802

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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 121, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	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 receingiority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sco	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report	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	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 40%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO	.070	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%	NO		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

District

TEXAS PREPARATORY SCHOOL

County District No

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	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 13 County District No 227905 TEXAS SCH FOR THE BLIND & VISUALLY **IMPAIRED**

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	0%	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		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	100%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	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.	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		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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math #NA	Math #NA	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
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		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 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)

Region County District No

TEXAS SCH FOR THE BLIND & VISUALLY IMPAIRED

District

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	small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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

TEXAS SCH FOR THE DEAF

County District No

Region

13

227906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	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 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		#NA	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	100%	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				Data Repor	J			
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	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	#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		small		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math #NA	Math #NA	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		VEC	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		children aged 3 through 5		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)

District

Region

227906

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 a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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

TEXAS SERENITY ACADEMY

County District No

Region

06 170801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA		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	#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 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				Data Report	J			
	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 69%	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/	F0 70/	VEC	,	district level ot reported		
	83%	59%	NO	31%	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 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		children aged 3 through 5		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 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 TEXAS SERENITY ACADEMY

Region County District No 170

06 170801

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

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

District	TEXHOMA ISC

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 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% 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 86% 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 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

Region 16
County District No 211901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	211901
District	TEXHOMA 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.		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	TEXLINE ISD

16

056902

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 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 80% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 60% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 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	056902
District	TEXLINE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	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.		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)

227824 County District No THE EAST AUSTIN COLLEGE PREP ACADEMY

District

Region

13

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 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 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 56% 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

Region

District

THE EAST AUSTIN COLLEGE PREP 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 Due to small numbers, dis level data are 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.		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 THE RHODES SCHOO

Region

County District No

04

101861

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	81%	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		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	program; and (b) separate specture and control of the separate specture and control of the services in the services in the regular early of the services in the servic		Targets no	t required for	for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le			
	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		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 75%	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		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	INO		1 5	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)

	C	·Οι	1111	y	DI:	Sti	IC	LI	VO	

District THE RHODES 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	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	education or in some other postsecondary 1/1% 1/60% N()		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

THE VARNETT PUBLIC SCHOOL

County District No

Region

04

101814

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	82%	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 Baseline Data Reporting Targets not required for FF			ū	
	residential facility.		T		T	T	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 numbers, district lev	
	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 95%	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 71%	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	001	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)

District

THE VARNETT PUBLIC SCHOOL

Region 04
County District No 101814

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of 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		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, disi level data are reported	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	THORNDALE ISD

13

166905

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 78% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 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% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 54% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 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	
 THE PART 10 P	

Region

District THORNDALE ISD

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	THRALL ISD

13

246912

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 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% 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 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)

Kegion	
County District No	246912

District THRALL 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)

THREE RIVERS ISD District

Region County District No 149902

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	78%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	38%	NO			
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	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 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 so	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 Statement Statement		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 reporte				
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				
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported			
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	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		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)

triot	TUDEE DIVERS	ICD

District THREE RIVERS ISD

Region

County District No.

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District THREE WAY ISD	District	THREE WAY ISD
------------------------	----------	---------------

Region

County District No

11

072901

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 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
District	THREE WAY ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	THROCKMORTON ISD

Region

County District No

09

224901

State 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	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	18%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	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 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 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 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 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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	o school year for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summai	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 THROCKMORTON 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	TIDEHAVEN ISD

03

158902

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 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 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 75% 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 Biothiot 110	.0000_
District	TIDEHAVEN 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	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	TIMPSON ISD	

07

210905

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 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 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 _	210905
intriot	TIMPSON ISD	

TIMPSON 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	TIOGA ISD	

Region

County District No

10

091907

State 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	56%	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	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	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		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 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
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	days in a school year for children with dem	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)

	000 2.000	
District	TIOGA 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)

Region	
County District No	111903

TOLAR ISD District ____

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	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		*	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	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			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		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	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 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	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	3.570	140		120			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 No _	111903
strict	TOLAR ISD	

District TOLAR 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	TOM BEAN ISD

Region

County District No

10

091918

State 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	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	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 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 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	J	
						education class, separate so residential facility.	enool or		1	T	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 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	69%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	60%	60.6%	TES		small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are not 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	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 78	0.576	NO		ILS	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 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 _	091
4	TOM DEAN ICD	

District TOM BEAN 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/.

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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	TOMBALL	ISE

77%

76%

YES

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Region

County District No

04

101921

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 76% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 2% 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 NO YES 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% 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 80% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 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

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	101921
	_	
etrict	TOMBALLISD	

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	TORNILLO ISD

19

071908

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 71% 68% 67% NO 76% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 8% 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 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 60% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 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	TORNILLO ISD

Region

071908

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

TRANSFORMATIVE CHARTER ACADEMY

County District No

Region

12

014802

State 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	57%	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	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	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	0%	NO	education class, separate scresidential 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 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
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	0%	NO		Statement 2	0.70	30.1. 73			
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	0.570	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

County District No _____01480
TRANSFORMATIVE CHARTER ACADEMY

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

TREETOPS SCHOOL INTERNATIONAL

County District No

Region

11

220801

State 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	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for					·	
	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	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	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	69%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1		30.070			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	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.50/	NO		YES	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 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 ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 220
TREETOPS SCHOOL INTERNATIONAL

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

C	County District No	221905
_		

Region

District TRENT 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 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	91%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	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 program; and (b) separate si	lar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	Ū	
	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	Due to 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 repor	
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		00.070			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	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.50/	NO		YES	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 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement		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 _	221905
TRENT ICD	

District TRENT 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	TRENTON ISD	

10

074912

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 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 84% 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 72% 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 _	074912
ictrict	TRENTON 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	TRINIDAD ISD

07

107907

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 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% 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 33% 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 _	10/90/
istrict	TRINIDAD 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	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 TRINITY BASIN PREPARATORY

Region 10 County District No 057813

				i cuci	ai i iscai i c	ai 2011 (2011-12)	Dist		113114111	DASIN FRE	-I ANATON	<u> </u>
State 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	numbers, o data are n	district leve ot 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
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 63%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	09/	0.59/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		169			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

County District No _____
TRINITY BASIN PREPARATORY

Region

057813

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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	TRINITY CHARTER S
District	IIVIINII I CIIAIVILIN S

CHOOL

County District No

Region

13

046802

State 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	50%	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	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 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	3%	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 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 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 14%	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 level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 7%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	acquisition and use of		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	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 special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

Region County District No

TRINITY CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers 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

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

District	TRINITY ISD	

06

228903

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 NO 75% 77% YES 67% 68% 67% NO 76% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 25% NO 10% 11% NO 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 "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 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 41% 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 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 _	220903
District	TRINITY 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	TROUP ISD	

07

212904

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	67%	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	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 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 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 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 68%	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 68%	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	0.5%	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 _	212904
trict	TROUP 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		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary 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 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/.

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

County District No	014310

Region

District TROY 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	90%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		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 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	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				
	3070	0070	120	10070	120							
	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	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	70%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /6	00.076	123	Due to small numbers, district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 61%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				0170		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 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	014910
TROV ICD	

Region

12

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	TULIA ISD	

16

219903

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 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 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 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 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 _	219903
otriot	TIII IA ISD	

Region

District TULIA IS

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District TULOSO-MIDWAY ISD

Region

County District No

02

178912

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	92%	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	10%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	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 99%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	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 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 59%	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 statement 1 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	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
District	TULOSO-MIDWAY ISD

TULOSO-MIDWAY ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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)

TURKEY-QUITAQUE ISD District

Region 16 County District No 096905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	88%	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	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	Reading	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 a program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	3370	3370	120	10070	123	education class, separate so residential facility.							
			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 achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 70%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math		Summary	570/	50.70/	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	40%	NO		Statement 2 5	57%	58.7%				
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	rate of	% 0.5%	NO		YES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
	070	0.3%	INO		1 1 2 3		Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district data are not rep		
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	TURKEY-QUITAQUE ISD
JUICE	I OKKE I -QUITAQUE IOD

Region

County District No

16

096905

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 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/.

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)

TWO DIMENSIONS PREPARATORY ACADEMY

District

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

County District No

Region

04

101840

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No TWO DIMENSIONS PREPARATORY ACADEMY

District

101840

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 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	TYLER ISD	

07

212905

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO		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	10%	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	7%	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	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
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	Due to 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		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		NO	NO 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% Summary Statement 2 72% 73.1%		82.7%	YES		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.3%	INO		INO			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		NO	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	212905

Region

District TYLER 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	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		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 **UNION GROVE ISD**

Region

County District No

07

230908

State 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	76%	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 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	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 seeducation class, separate seeducation class.	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		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 75%	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 level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 75%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	, .	ot reported
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
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%	INO		1 1 2 3			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	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	UNION GROVE 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	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)

UNION HILL ISD District

Region County District No 230904

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 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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Reporting Year						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate specification class, separate so residential facility.	pecial	Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		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 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
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	F70/	50.70/	VEO		district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	58%	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 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 /0	0.576	140		1123			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	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	230904
District	LINION HILL 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	UNITED ISD

01

240903

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 89% 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 YES 10% 11% NO 4% 10% 13% NO 18% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 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 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 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 _	240903
intriot	LINITED ISD	

Region

strict UNITED 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 t?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	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)

County District N

District UNIVERSAL ACADEMY

Region

10

057808

State 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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –		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				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	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 95%	Reading YES	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 76%	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 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
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	,	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 UNIVERSAL ACADEMY

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

Region County District No

04 101807

District

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met 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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 		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				Data Repor	Ü	
						residential facility.	1		1	1	1	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	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 83%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	_				,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	83%	YES	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
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 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		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)

HINIVERSITY OF HOUSTON CHARTE

Region 04
County District No 101807

District UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON CHARTER SCHOOL

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

County District No **UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS**

Region

11

061501

State 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 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	Reading YES	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Report	0	
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		small
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
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	0070	00.070	120		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math #NA	Math #NA	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				71.973		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	, ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No

Region

061501

rict UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	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 13
County District No 227819

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS ELEMENTARY CHARTER
District SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –		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% YI		YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading 94%	Reading NO	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 Report	Ū	
						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		small district level
	95%	99%	YES	94%	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	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	69%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	60%	00.0%	TES		small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	83%	59%	NO	88%	YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	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)

Region County District No 227819
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS ELEMENTARY CHARTER

District SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual e Performance Report Indicators et?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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 13 County District No 227806

District

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS UNIVERSITY CHA

State 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	69%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	84%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	24%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		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 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Repor	•	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 21%	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		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
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)

District

County District No 22780
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS UNIVERSITY CHA

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

Region 10 County District No 057843

District UPLIFT EDUCATION - HAMPTON PREPARATORY

State 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	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	ar early iving the and related			Data Repor	•	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate specture and control of the program of t	pecial		rargets no	r required for	FF1 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 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	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	63%	NO	mowedge 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	U 76	0.5%	NO		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 invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No

10 057843

Region

District UPLIFT EDUCATION - HAMPTON PREPARATORY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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	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

UPLIFT EDUCATION - NORTH HILLS PRE

County District No

Region

10

057803

State 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	95%	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 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 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 district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 74%	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	0%	0.5%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No _____05780
UPLIFT EDUCATION - NORTH HILLS PRE

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

UPLIFT EDUCATION - PEAK PREPARATORY

Region

County District No

10

057838

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 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 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO 1% 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 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 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 80% 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)

District

County District No <u>057838</u>

UPLIFT EDUCATION - PEAK PREPARATORY

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District UPLIFT EDUCATION - WILLIAMS PREPARATORY

10

057842

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 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 2% 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO YFS than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 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 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 68% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 81% 82.7% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No _

District UPLIFT EDUCATION - WILLIAMS PREPARATORY

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 County District No 220816 UPLIFT EDUCATION-SUMMIT INTERNATIONAL

11

District _____ PREPARATORY

State 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	87%	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	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 21, served in separate schoof facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate se	nular early seiving the on and related by childhood special Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
		.	M (1			residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool	Summary	700/	04.004	\/F0		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
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	74%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80 /8	80.676	123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	79%	NO		Statement 2	07 70	00.7 70	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	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		153	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	tho 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 11
County District No 220816

UPLIFT EDUCATION-SUMMIT INTERNATIONAL PREPARATORY

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/.

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	UTOPIA ISE

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

for children with disabilities

Region 20
County District No 232904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	232904
	· -	
District	LITOPIA 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 | ocal Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

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

District	UVALDE CISD
DISTRICT	OVALUE CIOU

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 54% 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 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 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 97% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 46% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 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

Region 20
County District No 232903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District
District	UVALDE CISD

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 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 **VALENTINE ISD**

Region

County District No

18

122902

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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	#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		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		*	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 #NA	Reading #NA	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						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.		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	,	ot reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	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	#NA	#NA	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES			
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%	INU		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	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	VALENTINE ISD	

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

VALLEY MILLS ISD District

Region 12 County District No 018904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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 IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	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 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early.		1%	1%	YES	8%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading Reading with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Reporting Year							
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc 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	Due to small numbers, district lever 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 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	D 1	!!
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	60%	NO	demonstrate improved						small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 47%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	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 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	VALLEY MILLS ISD

Region 12
County District No 018904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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	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 **VALLEY VIEW ISD**

Region 01 County District No 108916

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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 IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	73%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	15%	NO		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	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 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 the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FI					•	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				Ü					
	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 73%	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	C					district level ot reported		
	83%	59%	NO	75%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		-		
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 district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported		

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

VALLEY VIEW ISD
County District No

District VALLEY VIEW 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%	ОМ	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	VALLEY VIEW ISD

Region County District No 049903

State 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	59%	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	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	1%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related 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 FEY						
	95%	99%	YES	97%	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		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 81%	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	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary		57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported		
	83%	59%	NO	78%	NO	Statement 2		57 %	30.7%	163				
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.570	140			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported		

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

		()(DUI	nt	y	District	: No

District VALLEY VIEW 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 T		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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	VAN ALSTYNE ISD
DISTRICT	VAN ALS I THE ISD

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 88% 68% 67% NO 82% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 7% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 92% 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 81% 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 091908 County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	,
District	VAN ALSTYN

Region County District No 091908 **VAN ALSTYNE ISD**

10

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No 234906

Region

07

District _ **VAN 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	88%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	78%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	13%	NO		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		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 98%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		Baseline Data Rep Targets not required		•	ŭ	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	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 70%	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 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Stateme		57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, distr data are not re	
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	3.370	.10		. 20	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 _	234906
liatriat	VANIED	

Region

ct VAN I

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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 **VAN VLECK ISD**

Region County District No 158906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	83%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	75%	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	10%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	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	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	with IEPs attending (a) regul- childhood program and recei- majority of special education			ed Baseline Data Reporting Y			
						residential facility.			<u> </u>			
	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	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	_				,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	48%	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		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	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education 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 VAN VLECK 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)

intriat

Region 01
County District No 108808

District

VANGUARD ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met 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	85%	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 Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 201			J	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, 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	Reading 84%	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 58%	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 Stateme		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%	INO		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	1000
VANGUARD ACADEMY	
	VANGUARD ACADEMY

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	VEGA ISD

16

180902

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 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 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% 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 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	180902
VEGALOD	

Region

District VEGA ISD

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

Region	
County District No	126908

District **VENUS ISD**

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	91%	YES	5A : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	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	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 201					·	
	3370	3370	120	3370	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	66%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		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	data are n	ot reported		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3.70		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	120300
District	VENUS ISD	
DISITICI	VENUS 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 **VERIBEST ISD**

Region

County District No

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	90%	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	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 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			Data Reporting Year t required for FFY 2011				
	Math Math Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1		Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 65%	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 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 0.5% NO		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	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	VERIBEST ISD	

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

istrict	VERNON ISD	

09

244903

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 81% 68% 67% NO 66% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 5% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 10% 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 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 57% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 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	244903
VEDVICE 100	

Region

District VERNON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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

County District No 235902 **VICTORIA 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?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	72%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	70%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	13%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		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 rece majority of special education			Data Repor	J		
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so 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		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
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	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	53%	NO		Statement 2	57%	56.7%	TES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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	of appropriate behaviors 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 small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	235902
\#0T0DI4 I0D	

Region

District VICTORIA 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		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	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

County District No

04

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#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	46%	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		*	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 90%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			•	Data Reporting Year required for FFY 2011			
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool			Ι	<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	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	56%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported		
4A: Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	50%	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		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 small district level ot reported		

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	10186
District	VICTORY PREP	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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	VIDOR ISD	

Region

County District No

05

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	84%	YES		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	10%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	21%	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) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.			e Data Repor	· ·			
	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 achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 45%	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 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	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 Summar Statemen		72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	181907
ictrict	VIDOR 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

VISTA DEL FUTURO CHARTER SCHOOL

County District No

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 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 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 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate specification class, separate scresidential facility.		l argets no	required for FFT 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	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	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	076	0.5%	NO		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 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

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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 VYSEHRAD ISD

Region

County District No

03

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met 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		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				•	ata Reporting Year equired for FFY 2011				
				10070		education class, separate so residential facility.	chool or								
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small			
	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	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	60%	60.6%	TES		small district level			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported			
	83%	59%	NO	80%	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		small district level			
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.576	NO		ILS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported			
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	VYSEHRAD 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	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	WACO CHARTER S
District	WACC CHANTEN

County District No 161801 SCHOOL

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	50%	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		*	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 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	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 achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 45%	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		Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	a school year for children with demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summar	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	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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

WACO CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	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)

strict	WACO ISD	

Region

County District No

12

161914

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 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 22% NO 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 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 47% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 57% YES 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 43% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO NO 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 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region	12
County District No	161914

District WACO 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	WAELDER ISD

13

089905

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 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 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 44% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 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 _	089905
_4	WAEL DED ICD	

District WAELDER 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	WALCOTT IS
District	TIALOUII IO

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 57% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 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 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

Region 16 059902 County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	·	
District	WALCOTT 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 **WALIPP-TSU PREPARATORY ACADEMY**

04

101864

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 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% 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 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)

District

WALIPP-TSU PREPARATORY ACADEMY

County District No

Region

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

Region

County District No

15

226906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	86%	YES	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	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		*	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			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		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 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 72%	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 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	U 76	0.5%	INO		TES		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 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 _	226906
intrint	WALLISD	

trict WALL 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	WALLER ISD

04

237904

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 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 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 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 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 _	237904
^	WALLEDIED	

Region

District WALLER 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%	ОМ	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers 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	WALNUT BEND ISD

Region

County District No

11

049908

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 data are not reported Math 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)

		(ان	Οl	ını	y	Dis	stri	ct	N	(

District WALNUT BEND 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	WALNUT SPRINGS ISD

Region

County District No

12

018905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	67%	NO	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	33%	NO		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	28%	NO
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 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				
	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 numbers, district leve data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 44%	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
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%	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 invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No
District	WALNUT SPRINGS ISD

Region

level data are not

reported

LEA LEA State State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable and ethnic groups in special education postsecondary goals that are annually updated and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition YES 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

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	WARREN ISD
District	

05

229904

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 70% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 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 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 96% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 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 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 _	229904
etrict	WADDENISD	

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	WASKOM ISD

Region

County District No

07

102903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	91%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	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	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	Due to		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 reporte		
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 45%	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	Due to s		
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	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	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	102303
	_	
District	WASKOM ISD	

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

WATER VALLEY ISD District

Region 15 County District No 226905

State 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	39%	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	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	18%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and 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 sc residential facility.	nooi or		T	T	I	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
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	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	53%	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/	0.50/	NO		VES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use		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 small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State 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	WATER VALLEY ISE

WATER VALLEY ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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

WAXAHACHIE FAITH FAMILY ACADEMY

County District No 070801

Region

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	0%	NO	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	100%	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		*	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2012					0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		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	80%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
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 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 child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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)

WAXAHACHIE ISD District

Region

County District No

10

070912

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	58%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	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 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul- childhood program and recei- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate so- residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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 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 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
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		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.376	140		ILG			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	WAXAHACHIE 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	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 ___ WEATHERFORD ISD

Region

County District No

11

184903

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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	98%	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 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – class less	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	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
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 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
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 76	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 _
District	WEATHERFORD ISD

Region

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

Region

County District No

01

240904

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 100% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 0% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 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 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 68% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv 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 _	240904	
etrict	WERR CISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	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/.

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	WEIMAR ISD

03

045905

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 100% 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 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% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 50% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 58% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level

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 _	045905
triot	WEIMADISD	

Region

District WEIMAR 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	WELLINGTON ISD

16

044902

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 41% 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 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
District	WELLINGTON ISD

Region

16

044902

level data are not

reported

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

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No 2

17 223904

District ____

WELLMAN-UNION 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	100%	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	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 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seeducation class, separate seeducation facility.	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 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 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 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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	or for children with 0% 0.5% NO TES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Sumr	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	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

WELLMAN-UNION 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 a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	WELLS ISD	

07

037909

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No	037909

Region

District WELLS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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)

strict	WESLACO ISD

Region

County District No

01

108913

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 75% 68% 67% NO 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 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% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 58% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary 57% YES 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 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 Biothiot 140	.000.0		
District	WESLACO ISD			
טוסנווטנ	WESTAGGISD			

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

County District No **WEST HARDIN COUNTY CISD**

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	67%	NO	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	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	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Reporting						
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	pecial		l argets no	ot required for	d 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		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 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		small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 39%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.50/	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0.5%	INO		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 special education services w schools facilitated parent invi 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

Region County District No

100908

trict WEST HARDIN COUNTY 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 a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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)

County District No	161916

Region

12

District **WEST 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	92%	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	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	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 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 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%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	43%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	30.070	120		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 39%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	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	TC: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs TC: Percent of preschool Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2 Summary Statement 2 72% 73.1%		82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		1 1 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)

rtogion	
County District No	161916

District WEST 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)

WEST ORANGE-COVE CISD District

Region

County District No

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 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	81%	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	15%	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	3%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading 97%	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 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 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 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	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 70	0.576	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte	
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)

WEST ORANGE-COVE CISD District

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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		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	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	WEST OSO ISD
District	WEST OSO ISD

02

178915

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 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 NO 10% 11% NO 17% 10% 13% NO 23% NO than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 98% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 98% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 42% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 40% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	,	
District	WEST OSO ISD	

Region

County District No

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

07

201914

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	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		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	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 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 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	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 65%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district leve 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 Statement 1 with IEPs who		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 Summa Stateme		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	201914
District	WEST RUSK ISD	

Region

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

07

202905

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	82%	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	18%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special Baseline Data Reporting Ye Targets not required for FFY 2					·	
										<u> </u>	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	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	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					o small district level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3370		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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

District **WEST SABINE 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 WESTBROOK ISD

Region

County District No

14

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met 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	60%	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	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	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				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 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 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 71%	Math NO	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 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		1123	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
District	WESTBROOK ISD

WESTBROOK ISD

Region

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

Region

County District No

03

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance 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	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		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 speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	tending (a) regular early rogram and receiving the pecial education and related the regular early childhood d (b) separate special ass, separate school or Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	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 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	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 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	U70	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 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	062905
District	WESTHOFF 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

WESTLAKE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

County District No

Region

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		State Target	State Rate	State Met 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	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/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.		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 Ye Targets not required for FFY 2			·	
	0070	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 Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	88%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		0.504				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 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 22081
WESTLAKE 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	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)

strict	WESTPHALIA ISC
SUIGU	WESTFINALIA ISL

Dist

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	#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	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	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 education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special Baseline Data Reporting Yea Targets not required for FFY 20			·	
	3370	3370	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	70%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/	NO		V50	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)

	(ou	nty	/ I	פוכ	stri	CŢ	IN

District **WESTPHALIA 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 ___ WESTWOOD 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 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		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	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		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district data are not rep	
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 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	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	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)

ri ot	WESTWOOD ISD

Region

County District No.

District WESTWOOD 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	WHARTON ISD
DISTRICT	WHARIONISD

03

241904

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 74% 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 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 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 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 66% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to 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 Diomot 140	
District	WHARTON ISD	
DISTRICT	WHARIUNIOU	

Region

County District No.

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District WHEELER ISD

Region County District No 242903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	94%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#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.				Data Reporting Year required for FFY 2011			
	9576	9976	123	10078	123								
	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%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	68%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /6	00.070	123	Due to numbers, 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	53%	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		small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	school year for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate helaviors to Summ	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 invi 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	WHEELER 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 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary in the time they left school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		numbers level dat	o small s, district 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	WHITE DEER ISD

16

033904

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 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 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 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 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 Biothot No
ri ot	WHITE DEED ICD

Region

County District No.

District WHITE DEER ISD 1 = 4

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO	YES	
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	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	WHITE OAK ISI

07

092908

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 86% 68% 67% NO 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 11% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 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 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 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 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

District WHITE OAK ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District WHITE SETTLEMENT ISD

Region 11 County District No 220920

State 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	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	71%	YES
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		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	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data R services in the regular early childhood Targets not require					•	·			
	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 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	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	69%	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	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Sumi	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported					
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region County District No

WHITE SETTLEMENT 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	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/.

10 days in a school year of children with

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

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

District	WHITEFACE CISE

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 97% 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 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 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

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

17 Region 040902 County District No

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 WHITEFACE CISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at 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	WHITEHOUSE 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 88% 68% 67% NO 73% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 8% 10% 13% NO 10% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 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 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 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

07 Region County District No 212906

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	2
rict	WHITEHOUSE ISD	

Region

District WHITEHOUSE 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	WHITESBORO ISD
District	WITH LODGING IOL

County District No 091909

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	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	59%	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		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 with IEPs attending (a) regul- childhood program and recei- majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate spendication class, separate so- residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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 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 59%	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	070	0.070	140		120	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	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)

	Cot	irity	וטי	Suic	LIN

District WHITESBORO 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	WHITEWRIGHT ISD

Region

County District No

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	86%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	76%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	14%	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		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate scresidential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
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	th acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary		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	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 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 _	091
 WHITEWOLGHT ICO	

Region

District WHITEWRIGHT 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%	56% 57% YES Due to sr numbers, d level data a reporte		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	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

WHITHARRAL ISD

Region

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		State Target	State Rate	State Met 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 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 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%	81.2% YES Du		e 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 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 50%	Math NO	agguigition and upp of		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	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	WHITHARRAL 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	year of leaving high school 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region

County District No

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	49%	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	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	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.	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 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 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 47%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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 /6	0.576	NO		ILS			72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
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 _	109911
District	WHITNEY 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	,
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	numbers level dat	,

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

09 243905

District

WICHITA FALLS ISD

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	96%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	76%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	3%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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		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						
	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		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 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	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 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 WICHITA FALLS ISD

Region 09
County District No 243905

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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	,
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region

County District No

16

180904

District ____ WILDORADO ISD LEA **LEA Met** State State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA 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 -21, served inside the regular class less of high school VES 10% NO ΝО

3	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	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) regular childhood program and receimajority 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 Report required for	porting Year for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
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		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 75%	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	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	NO		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 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
District	WILDORADO ISD

Region

180904

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)

	County District No	170904
District	WILLIS ISD	

Region

06

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 91% 68% 67% NO 56% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 6% 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 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 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 66% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv 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	170904
ict	WILLIGIED	

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 a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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 WILLS POINT ISD

Region 10
County District No 234907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	92%	YES	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	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		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 97%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 201			Ū	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
	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 53%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 45%	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		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.576	IVO		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)

		C	C	u	nτ	y	ט	IST	ric	ΣŢ	INC)

WILLS POINT ISD District

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in 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	WILSON ISD
District	WILSON 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	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		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.		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 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	75%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 75%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are not report	
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 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 _	153907
District	WILSON 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 WIMBERLEY ISD

Region

County District No

13

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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 IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	75%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		13%	NO	11%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	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 96%	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		o small
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 76%	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 75%	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		125	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	10590
1.2.1	WIMDED! EV IOD	

District WIMBERLEY ISD

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

strict	WINDTHORST ISD

Dist

Region

County District No

09

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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 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 IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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	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.		lar early iving the and related Baseline Data Reporting Ye			J	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				rargets no	ot required to	FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level 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	000/	00.00/	VEC		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	79%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	79%	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	0 /0	0.576	INO		ILS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	not reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level 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	
 WINDTH COOK IOD	

District WINDTHORST ISD

Region

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	WINFIELD 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 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	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	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 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 90%	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.	ular early siving the n and related schildhood special Targets not required for F			· ·		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
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 33%	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 Summar Statemen		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 _	223903
	_	
District	WINFIELD 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	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)

10 057828

Region

County District No

District

WINFREE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOLS

State 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	32%	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	36%	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	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for				·		
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
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	3070	30.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 15%	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				1370		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

Region County District No

WINFREE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOLS

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	WINK-LOVING I

18

248902

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 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 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 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
District	WINK-LOVING ISD

WINK-LOVING ISD

Region

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

07

250907

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	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	38%	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	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		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	15%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate seresidential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	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 65%	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	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 51%	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 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	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 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)

strict	WINNSBORO 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 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 WINONA ISD

07

212910

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	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	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		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	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seeducation class, separate seeducation for the services in the services and the services are services as the services are services and services and services are services as the services are services and the services are services as the services are	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 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 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	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	nool year for children with 0% 0.5% NO YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summar	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported						
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	212910
intriot	WINONAIGD	

Region

trict WINONA 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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No	200904

Region

WINTERS 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	86%	YES	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	0%	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	2%	NO	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading YES	Reading 96%	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>					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	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	44%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	3070	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	32%	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	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.076	140		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte			
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 _	200904
District	WINTERS ISD	

District WINTERS 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	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to 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	WODEN ISD

07

174906

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 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 YES 10% 11% NO 8% 10% 13% NO 19% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 26% 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 57% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 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	174906
atri at	WODENIED	

Region

District WODEN ISD

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

Region

County District No

10

116909

State 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	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		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 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 se	lar early iving the a and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	ŭ	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	96%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
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 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 85%	Math acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2 57%		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	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	070	0.070	110		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	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State 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 WOLFE CITY ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district 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	WOODSBORO ISD

Region

County District No

03

196902

State 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	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	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 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 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	97%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp	vices in the regular early childhood gram; and (b) separate special cation class, separate school or dential facility.			or FFY 2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 45%	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 33%	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 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	INO		1 5		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	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	WOODSBORO ISD	

Region

County District No.

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

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	WOODSON ISD

09

224902

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 50% 68% 67% NO 54% 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 50% 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 78% 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 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 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 _	224902
	·	
District	WOODSON 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	WOODVILLE ISD

05

229903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 93% 68% 67% NO 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 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 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 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 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 Distinct.
 WOODVILLEICD

District WOODVILLE 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		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	OZ	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	

About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

12

081905

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 83% 68% 67% NO 91% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 17% NO 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% 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 65% 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)

	•	
District	WORTHAM 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?	let State Performance Plan/ Annual ate 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 Due to small numbers, district level data are not 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	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	WYLIE ISD	

10

043914

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 81% 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 11% NO than 40% of the day 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 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 77% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 70% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 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)

C	ounty District No	043914

Region

District WYLIE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		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		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 156% YES		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	WYLIE ISD

Region

County District No

14

221912

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 89% 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 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 YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YFS education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 77% 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 79% 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	221912
iot	WYLEICD	

District WYLIE IS

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	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school in effect at the time they left 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)

YANTIS ISD	

District

County District No

Region

07

250905

State 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	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	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	5%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES		ation class, separate school or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district 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	89%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	3070	30.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 89%	Math YES	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						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		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	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 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 _	250905
ot	VANTIC ICD	

Region

District YANTIS IS

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

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating

2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out

subgroup that meets the State's minimum

3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs

4A: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

10 days in a school year for children with

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

0%

0.7%

NO

achievement standards

IEPs

"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

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

District YES PREP PUBLIC SCHOOLS INC LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** 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 NO 75% 77% YES 50% 68% 67% NO 100% YES 80% or more of the day 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -21, served inside the regular class less 25% 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 -21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 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 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) 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 Due to small 87% 63% NO 60% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 59% NO 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES 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 demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2

meet their needs

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

04

101845

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

77%

76%

YES

Region

County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

County District No 10
YES PREP PUBLIC SCHOOLS INC

Region

101845

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

03

062903

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 86% 68% 67% NO 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 7% 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 NO 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 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 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 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	002303	
	· -		Τ
District	YOAKUM ISD		
District	YOAKUM 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		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	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	YORKTOWN ISD
District	1011110111100

Region

County District No

03

062904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	84%	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	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	5%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc	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 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 achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 39%	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 46%	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
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0.576	NO		of appropriate hehaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invimeans of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	YORKTOWN 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		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	19
County District No	071905
	•

YSLETA 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	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	66%	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		10%	13%	NO	18%	NO		
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		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 YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate seducation class, separate se			Data Repor	ŭ				
	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summary		Summary	700/	04.004	\/F0								
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Statement 1	79%	81.2%	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	62%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	60.6%	163		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	59%	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		small		
Ps 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	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	07 1905
	·	
District	YSI FTA 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		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 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 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	ZAPATA COUNTY IS
DISTRICT	ZAPATA COUNTY IS

01

253901

Region

County District No

LEA State State **LEA Met** State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 86% 68% 67% NO 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 NO 10% 11% NO 14% 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 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 99% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 52% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 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
District	ZAPATA COUNTY ISD

ZAPATA COUNTY ISD

Region

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

ZAVALLA ISD District

Region County District No 003906

07

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annua Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	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	77%	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	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 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 so residential facility.	lar early iving the a and related childhood pecial		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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 66%	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	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 small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	ZAVALLA ISD

County District No. ZAVALLA 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	ZEPHYR ISD

15

025906

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 79% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 10% 11% NO #NA #NA 10% 13% NO 7% YFS than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved, numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YFS skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 60% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 50% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 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	15
County District No	025906

ZEPHYR 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 a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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)

ZOE LEARNING ACADEMY District

Region

County District No

04

101850

State 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	57%	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		*	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			
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	th 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 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
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level not reported
	83%	59%	NO	49%	NO		Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.50/			\/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 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	YES numbers, district data are not rep		
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 volvement 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)

Region County District No

ZOE LEARNING ACADEMY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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/.