Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

80 172902

District

DAINGEF	FIELD-LONE	STAR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	11.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	4.5%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	22.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

ion 08 No 172902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District DAINC

DAINGERFIELD-LONE STAR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No

16 056901

District

DALHART 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	84.6%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	15.4%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.8%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	with IEPs attending a regular early		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	8.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 48.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 49.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	09/	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____

rict No 056901

16

District

DALHART 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 10 County District No

DALLAS CAN ACADEMY CHARTER

057804

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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	51.5%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	24.2%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	91.0%	NO			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	94.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 28.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 31.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 057804

10

DALLAS CAN ACADEMY CHARTER

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target? 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 057805

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

DALLAS COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with 1 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	with IEPs attending a regular early		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	VES		VES	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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receivin special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

10

For information about the State Performance Plan/ In Performance Plan/ I

Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/ 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No 0

District DALLAS COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 3A, 4A-B, 9, 10, 11,12, and 13 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting in a given indicator, or were not analyzed due to data availability, are designated with N/A in the "LEA Rate" and/or "LEA Met State Target?" column.

Region 10 strict No 057805

Region County District No

10 057905

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DALLAS 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.5%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	19.9%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	with IEPs attending a regular early		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	12.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	30.1%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 52.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

10 057905

District

DALLAS 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 04 County District No 020910

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DAMON 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – r class less	≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	with IEPs attending a regular early		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 43.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 64.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

04 020910

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DAMON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, dist level data are reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

DANBURY ISD

04 020904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.4%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.7%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	28.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/		V/50			7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with LFD when	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____

ict No 020904

04

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DANBURY 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, dist level data are reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

16 148905

DARROUZETT 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	C 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with ICDs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070					≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

16 County District No 148905

District

DARROUZETT 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are r reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 12 County District No 175904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DAWSON 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.2%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 72.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076	160		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region ____ County District No

gion <u>12</u> t No **175904**

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DAWSON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to smal numbers, distr level data are reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____

17 058902

District

DAWSON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	91.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	1 0 / (/)		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	070	160		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____

ion <u>17</u> No **058902**

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DAWSON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 146902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DAYTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	30.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

04

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

04 146902

District

DAYTON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, dis level data are reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 047902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DE LEON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.5%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	42.9%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	VES		VES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with ICD who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

14

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

14 047902

District

DE LEON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no 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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are r 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, dist level data are reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

DECATUR 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.8%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.6%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	25.8%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 43.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 38.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						YES YES	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

11 249905

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

___ Region County District No

 Region
 11

 rict No
 249905

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DECATUR 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distr level data are r 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to smal numbers, distr level data are reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 04 County District No 101908

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DEER PARK ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Ann Performance Report Indicato		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	86.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.8%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	54.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs whoSummary Statement 1		≤ 17%	17%	YES	20.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 64.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with 15 percent	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0 76	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _ County District No

on 04 No 101908

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DEER PARK 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 80 County District No 019901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DEKALB ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	56.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	υ%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

08 019901

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

DEKALB ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to smal	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, dis level data are reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

13 227910

District

DEL VALLE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	82.4%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.7%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	17.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 47.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 48.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	120			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

______ County District No

 Region
 13

 istrict No
 227910

District

DEL VALLE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are r 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to smal numbers, distr level data are r reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ______ County District No 11

19 115903

County Dist

DELL CITY ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 state	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	υ%	υ%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

19 115903

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DELL 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 10 County District No 091903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DENISON 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.6%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	47.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 42.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____

strict No 091903

level data are not

reported

10

District

DENISON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

education or training program; or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

11 061901

District

DENTON 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	2.6%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.9%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with LCPs steading a constant aposit. 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	40.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	3.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 64.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	163		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receivir special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 11 County District No

061901

District

DENTON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

ion <u>17</u> No **251901**

District

DENVER CITY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	21.4%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	21.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 51.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 46.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receivin special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

17 County District No 251901

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DENVER 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

10 057906

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DESOTO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	68.1%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	15.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with PEPs attending a comparis, anoid). 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	83.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 51.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to numbers, c	o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

10 057906

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District

DESOTO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____ County District No _____

DETROIT ISD

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

LEA State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA 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 ≥ 78% NO 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 76.9% 66% 58.0% 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 ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% NO 5.8% YES ≤ 10% 14% 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% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.0% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES YES Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 61.5% majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special YES 100% YES ≤ 17% 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YES ≥ 95% 99% YES 100% skills (including social ≥ 61% 61.8% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate children aged 3 through 5 ≥ 80% 81.2% YES Statement 1 achievement standards with IEPs who Due to small ≥ 75% 59% NO 58.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 48.0% 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 YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary IEPs of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% 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

08 194905

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region ____ County District No

Region 08 trict No 194905

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District

t _____

DETROIT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 04 County District No 146903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DEVERS 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with LCDs attenting a second special. 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076	0%	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____1

nty District No 146903

04

District

DEVERS 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 20 County District No 163901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DEVINE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.3%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with LEOn of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	73.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	10.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receivin special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

20 163901

District

DEVINE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DEW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	37.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	25.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

12 081906

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 12 County District No 081906

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DEW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DEWEYVILLE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	74.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.4%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 49.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 35.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

05 176903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

05 County District No 176903

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DEWEYVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 20 County District No 163902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

D'HANIS 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with <i>I</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	57.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 62.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	VES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region ____ County District No

District No 163902

20

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

D'HANIS 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	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

07 Region County District No

003905

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DIBOLL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	93.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	82.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	6.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	40.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	IES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 003905

District

DIBOLL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No C

04 084901

District

DICKINSON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	22.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.1%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 <i>inajoing of special education and related</i> services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). <i>6B:</i> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	3.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	36.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

04 084901

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 082902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DILLEY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	60.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	19.7%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 52.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 48.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report tha schools facilitated parent involvement as means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

20

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

20 082902

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DILLEY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____ County District No _____1

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DIME BOX 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	 numbers, district leve data are not reported 	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 44.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 42.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	 numbers, district leve data are not reporte 	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	001	VEO		VEO	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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

13 144903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

13 144903

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 16 County District No 035901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DIMMITT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	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%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 43.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool Summary children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____

rict No 035901

16

District

DIMMITT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 133905

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DIVIDE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	N/A	N/A
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	N/A	N/A
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	N/A	N/A
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A : 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	N/A	N/A	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	N/A	N/A	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading N/A	Reading N/A	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math N/A	Math N/A	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

20

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

20 133905

District

DIVIDE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____

10 074904

District

DODD 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?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.5%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 86.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 79.0%	Math YES	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

10 074904

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

	DODD 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 01 County District No 108902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DONNA 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	64.4%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.8%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	10.4%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	33.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 45.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 01 County District No

108902

District

DONNA 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region ____ County District No

13 086024

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DOSS CONSOLIDATED CSD

State 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	50.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	50.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	BB: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	ildren aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0% 0% YES Y	YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small		
	070		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

Region 13 strict No 086024

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District

DOSS CONSOLIDATED CSD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

174911

DOUGLASS ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	40.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	60.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 95.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 61.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0%	VEO		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

07

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

Region 07 rict No 174911

District

DOUGLASS 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Cou

Region02County District No178801

District DR M L GARZA-GONZALEZ CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual e Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	66.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 20.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

For information about the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No 178801

Region

02

District DR M L GARZA-GONZALEZ 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

04 101856

DRAW ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

04 101856

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DRAW 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

13 105904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DRIPPING SPRINGS ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	93.3%	YES	through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recer majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	3.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	21.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076	0 76	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 105904

13

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

DRIPPING SPRINGS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

02 178905

District

DRISCOLL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.6%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 82.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 76.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	078	0 76	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

egion 02 ct No 178905

District

DRISCOLL 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 072902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DUBLIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	12.5%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	, , , , ,		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		listrict level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small listrict level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 58.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		00/	NE0		VE0	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		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		listrict 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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

11

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

11 072902

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DUBLIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 16 County District No 171901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DUMAS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	96.2%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.6%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	22.5%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	2.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	00/	YES		VEC	YES YES YES Summa	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 16 County District No 171901

District

DUMAS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9 : Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

10 057907

District

DUNCANVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.5%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	57.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.3%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	2.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	, , , , ,		≤ 17%	17%	YES	24.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 47.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with JED who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163				Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

n <u>10</u> o **057907**

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

DUNCANVILLE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 11 County District No 220918

District

EAGLE MT-SAGINAW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.4%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	1.1%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.5%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	18.2%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	18.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	09/	VES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District Region 11 County District No 220918

EAGLE MT-SAGINAW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EAGLE PASS 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	68.4%	NO	5A: Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with <i>l</i> 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	45.9%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	17.1%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		listrict level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with 15 percent	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

20 159901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

on <u>20</u> No <u>159901</u>

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EAGLE PASS 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 13 County District No 227909

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EANES ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	74.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	2.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.9%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	4.0%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	22.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 84.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 79.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with 15 percent	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

District

13 227909

EANES ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri- level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

15 Region County District No

025909

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EARLY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	44.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	22.2%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 74.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

District

EARLY ISD

15

025909

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No

03 241902

District

EAST BERNARD ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	93.0%	NO	10, ()		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 80.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 79.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	ES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 /0	113				Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

03 County District No 241902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EAST BERNARD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

20 015911

EAST CENTRAL 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	83.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.1%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	81.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.7%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	-	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 49.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	41.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES YES YES YES YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary Statement	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

County District No 015911

Region

20

EAST CENTRAL 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

05 036903

EAST CHAMBERS 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	48.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6-21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	75.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	6.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 77.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 78.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) ___ Region County District No 05

036903

EAST CHAMBERS 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Region County District No 2

us/special.ed/ of Performance on State Performance Plan Indica Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District EAST FORT WORTH MONTESSORI ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	90.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	, .	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 29.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 29.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7 C : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 st	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TEO		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

11 220811

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

For information about the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 11 County District No 220811

District EAST FORT WORTH MONTESSORI ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No

07 092801

EAST TEXAS CHARTER SCHOOLS 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	brogram; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	89.0%	YES	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		errepensed
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	09/	00/	VES		VEC	YES YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summa Statemen	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District

County District No 0

EAST TEXAS 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 Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 3A, 4A-B, 9, 10, 11,12, and 13 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting in a given indicator, or were not analyzed due to data availability, are designated with N/A in the "LEA Rate" and/or "LEA Met State Target?" column.

Region 07 strict No 092801

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____

14 067903

District

EASTLAND 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.8%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	16.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
		070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region _____

gion <u>14</u> t No **067903**

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EASTLAND 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

18 068901

District

ECTOR 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	68.3%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	24.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	56.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	11.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 37.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 34.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	ES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070					Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

18 0 068901

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ECTOR COUNTY 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 10 County District No 074905

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ECTOR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	50.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 86.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 68.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 10 County District No

074905

District

ECTOR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

01 108903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EDCOUCH-ELSA 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	59.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	24.6%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.0%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	42.9%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	2.9%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 47.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 108903

01

EDCOUCH-ELSA 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No 04

e r Targets

District

EDEN 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	66.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summon		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		listrict level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 82.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with UPDs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small listrict level ot reported

15 048901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No

District

EDEN CISD

15

048901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region ____ County District No

13 227803

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EDEN PARK ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 89.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES YES YES TC: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 227803

13

District

EDEN PARK 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established targets under the approved conditional No Child Left Behind (NCLB) waiver for specific provisions. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies 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

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

LEA

Met

State

Met

LEA

Region County District No

LEA

07 234903

LEA Met

State

EDGEWOOD ISD

State

Met

State

District

State

Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?	Performance Report I		Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	60.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.0%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	7B : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small listrict level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 66.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

07 234903

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EDGEWOOD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established targets under the approved conditional No Child Left Behind (NCLB) waiver for specific provisions. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies 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

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

IEPs by race and ethnicity

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

LEA

Met

State

LEA

Region County District No

015905

LEA Met

LEA

EDGEWOOD ISD

State

State

District

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	Met Target?	LEA Rate	State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	67.2%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.5%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	32.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 35.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 38.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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 hy race and ethnicity.	0%	0%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

for children with disabilities

20

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

gion <u>20</u> t No **015905**

District

EDGEWOOD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

01 108904

EDINBURG CISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	78.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	58.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.9%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.4%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	25.9%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	14.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	61.0%	NO	nnomougo una onno	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

on <u>01</u> lo <u>108904</u>

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EDINBURG 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 03 County District No

120901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EDNA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	77.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	53.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	, , , ,		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 53.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small listrict level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 38.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

03 County District No 120901

District

EDNA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region	10
County District No	05783

District EDUCATION CENTER INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	53.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	93.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 27.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 29.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than			NE0		VE0	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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

33

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

For information about the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 10 County District No 057833

District EDUCATION CENTER INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No _____1

05 123805

EHRHART SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6P: Porcent of children aged 2 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 30.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	0					district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	20.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		-
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0 76	115		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

on 05 No 123805

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EHRHART SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Annual te Performance Report Indicators et?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EL CAMPO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	56.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.1%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	11.5%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 43.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 40.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

03 241903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

gion 03 at No 241903

District

EL CAMPO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distr level data are r reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

19 071804

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EL PASO ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	60.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	26.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	94.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 24.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 5.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

19 071804

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EL PASO 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 19 County District No 071902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EL PASO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	18.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	42.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	11.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		listrict level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 53.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 55.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

19 071902

District

EL PASO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no 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%	98.6%	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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to smal numbers, distr level data are reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

District

ELECTRA 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with <i>l</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading			≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to numbers, c	o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 71.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to numbers, c	o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0 76	115		110		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to numbers, o data are n	

09 243902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

gion 09 t No 243902

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District

ELECTRA 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 011902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ELGIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	82.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	53.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 45.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 46.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with ICDs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

13

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 13 County District No 011902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ELGIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, dist level data are reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 001903

ELKHART 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 69.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		00/	VEC		VEO	NO Statement 2 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%	YES		TES			≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

07 001903

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ELKHART 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	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES		≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 102906

07

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ELYSIAN FIELDS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.9%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a paparets aportal. 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 81.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 64.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

07 County District No 102906

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ELYSIAN FIELDS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 10 County District No 070903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ENNIS 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.6%	YES	5A: Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	60.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	1.9%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	18.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	 program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 		≤ 17%	17%	YES	26.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 47.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 49.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TEO		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 10 County District No 070903

Inty District No

District

ENNIS 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to smal numbers, distr level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 11 County District No 049906

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ERA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	53.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 45.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 79.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	00/	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 11 County District No

049906

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ERA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

11 072802

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

ERATH EXCELS ACADEMY INC

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	91.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	86.0%	NO			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 22.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	VES		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with 15 percent	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 11 County District No 072802

ERATH EXCELS ACADEMY INC

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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

07 Region County District No 174910

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

ETOILE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.6%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	66.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 88.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 07 County District No 174910

District

ETOILE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 14 County District No 030906

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EULA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	74.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 74.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 14 County District No

030906

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EULA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 107905

District

EUSTACE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.2%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	9.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	18.2%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 80.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with 15 percent	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	.20			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

07 107905

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EUSTACE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

05 121906

EVADALE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	82.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.1%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading	Reading NO	Reading 78.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	61.0%	NO	Knowledge and Skills	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	076	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

05 121906

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District

EVADALE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 12 County District No 050901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EVANT 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	93.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 36.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	078	0 76	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 12 County District No

050901

District

EVANT 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to sma	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

11 220904

EVERMAN 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.2%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.4%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.1%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	14.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	19.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	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%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	55.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	2 00 /0	01.270	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		not reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	51.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 57 /0	50.970	113		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level not reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____

on <u>11</u> No **220904**

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EVERMA

EVERMAN 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

EVOLUTION ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	98.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	19.4%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	92.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 18.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 14.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

10 057834

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

For information about the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No 057834

Region

10

District EVOLUTION ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

101811

EXCEL ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1 : Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	93.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	100%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	6.1%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	93.0%	NO		ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Duo tr	o small
	≥ 75%	59%	NO	25.0%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 7.0%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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						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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

04

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region

County District No 101811

04

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EXCEL ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 0.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 0.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

01 108809

For information about the State Performance Plan/ In Deformation about the State Performance Plan/ 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/ 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

District

LEA LEA State LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met LEA Met Met Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate State Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 9: Percent of districts with 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable disproportionate representation of racial postsecondary goals that are annually updated and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition 0% 0% YES YES NO YES inappropriate identification assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in 10: Percent of districts with Due to small disproportionate representation of racial secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time numbers. district 0% YES YES YES and ethnic groups in specific disability 0% they left school, and were enrolled in higher ≥ 25% 27% level data are not education within one year of leaving high school. categories that is the result of reported inappropriate identification 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in 11: Percent of children who were 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% 98.6% NO YES ≥ 57% 59% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not year of leaving high school within which the evaluation must be 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 YES and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.7% NO education or in some other postsecondary ≥ 72% 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 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 3A, 4A-B, 9, 10, 11,12, and 13 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting in a given indicator, or were not analyzed due to data availability, are designated with N/A in the "LEA Rate" and/or "LEA Met State Target?" column.

Region 01 County District No 108809

Region County District No

07 210906

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EXCELSIOR 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	90.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 93.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	TC: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statem	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

ion <u>07</u> No <u>210906</u>

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EXCELSIOR 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

03 Region County District No 143906

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

EZZELL 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 143906

District

EZZELL ISD

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 Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 071903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FABENS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.6%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with LCPs attacking a segment special. 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	10.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 38.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

19

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 19 County District No

071903

District

FABENS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	,

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

FAIRFIELD ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	94.4%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.3%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 71.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 64.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

12 081902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

12 081902

District

FAIRFIELD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

FAITH FAMILY ACADEMY OF OAK CLIFF

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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	28.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	42.9%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 19.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 23.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

10 057815

For information about the State Performance Plan/ Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/ 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No

Region

10

057815

District FAITH FAMILY ACADEMY OF OAK CLIFF

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 04 County District No 101867 FALLBROOK COLLEGE PREPARATORY ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with 1 through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	83.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B : Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.7%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b). 6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 33.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0%	VEC		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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 04 County District No 101867 FALLBROOK COLLEGE PREPARATORY 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ______

20 128904

District

FALLS CIT	TY 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	92.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 89.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 89.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	076	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No

Region 20 128904

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

FALLS 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No C

08 060914

District

FANNINDEL 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 58.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

08 060914

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FANNINDEL 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	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time		27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

10 043904

FARMERSVILLE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	80.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 77.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 71.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region County District No 10

043904

FARMERSVILLE 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	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No _____

16 185902

District

FARWELL 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 40.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 42.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	09/	VES		VES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receivir special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

16 185902

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FARWELL 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	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A : Percent of youth who are no longer in		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time		27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

13 075906

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FAYETTEVILLE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	160		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

13 County District No 075906

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FAYETTEVILLE 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 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time 		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time		27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 070905

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FERRIS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	96.2%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.2%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	52.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	33.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 59.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

10

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

10 070905

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____

13 075901

District

FLATONIA 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.4%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	16.7%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 68.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

13 075901

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District

FLATONIA 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No _____

13 246902

District

FLORENCE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	59.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	28.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 55.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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 76				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

13 246902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FLORENCE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

20 247901

District

FLORESVILLE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	76.9%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.5%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.7%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.1%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	27.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	11.4%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	163		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

gion <u>20</u> t No **247901**

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FLORESVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Itet 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established targets under the approved conditional No Child Left Behind (NCLB) waiver for specific provisions. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies 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

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

IEPs by race and ethnicity

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

for children with disabilities

LEA

Met

State

Met

LEA

Region County District No

LEA

178914

LEA Met

State

FLOUR BLUFF ISD

State

Met

State

District

State

Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Target?	Rate	State Target?	Performance Report Indicators		Target	Rate	Target?	Rate	Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	74.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	54.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	9.1%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	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%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	69.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES	02.070	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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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	0%	0%	YES		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 abilitare with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

02

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

ion <u>02</u> No **178914**

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FLOUR BLUFF ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

17 077901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FLOYDADA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.5%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recer majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 25.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 36.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____

ct No 077901

District

FLOYDADA ISD

County District NO	U

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

10 057817

FOCUS LEARNING ACADEMY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	99.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 - 21, served in separate schools, residentia. facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 69.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	> 570/	F9.00/	YES		district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	55.0%	NO		Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	TES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070					Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 057817

10

District

FOCUS LEARNING ACADEMY

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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 16 County District No 148902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FOLLETT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	91.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool Summary h children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 80.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 70.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

16 148902

District

FOLLETT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

FORESTBURG ISD

09 169910

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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥68%	66%	NO	94.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	94.0%	NO	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 87.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 76.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	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%	0%	TES		TES		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region

County District No 169910

09

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FORESTBURG 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 10 County District No 129902

FORNEY ISD

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

LEA State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA 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 ≥ 78% NO 94.4% YES ≥ 68% NO 76.9% 66% 67.3% 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 ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 2.8% NO 13.7% ≤ 10% 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 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.3% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES NO Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 11.4% majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special YES 100% YES ≤ 17% 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 20.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YES ≥ 95% 99% YES 100% skills (including social ≥ 61% 61.8% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate children aged 3 through 5 ≥ 80% 81.2% YES Statement 1 achievement standards with IEPs who Due to small ≥ 75% 59% NO 70.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 66.0% 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 YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary IEPs of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% 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 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 10 County District No

129902

District

FORNEY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ______ County District No 11

18 114904

District

FORSAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	4.9%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 71.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160				≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

18 114904

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FORSAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No

04 079907

District

FORT BEND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	72.9%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	44.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.8%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	24.7%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	27.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	27.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 58.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		VEC	YES		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		163		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 079907

04

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

level data are not

reported

FORT BEND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number	o small s, district

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

one year of leaving high school.

education or training program; or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FORT ELLIOTT CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES		tial facility rcent of preschool n aged 3 through 5 Ps who Statement 1		17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who			81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, distri data are not re	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	I, modified, and alternate reading reading reading reading reading children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small					
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 81.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	6 0% YES	YES		Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
	0%	0%	TES		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

16 242906

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

16 242906

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FORT	ELLIOTT	CISD
		0100

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

18 186902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FORT STOCKTON 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	74.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.7%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	88.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

18 County District No 186902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FORT STOCKTON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 220809

FORT WORTH ACADEMY OF FINE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	children aged 3 through 5		81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 93.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 47.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	09/	0%	VES		VEC	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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

11

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

For information about the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 11 County District No 220809

District FORT WORTH ACADEMY OF FINE 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 Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

FORT WORTH CAN ACADEMY

11 220804

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	41.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	98.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A : 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	90.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 14.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported

2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	90.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 14.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 20.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

11

County District No 220804

District FO

FORT WORTH CAN ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

11 220905

FORT WORTH 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	55.9%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	26.1%	NO	5B : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.2%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	42.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	21.2%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 45.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	Z 73%		_			demonstrate improved acquisition and use of						district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 43.0%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	uala ale li	or reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		001	VEO		VEO	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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

11 220905

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FORT	WORTH	ISD
	WONTH	100

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	-		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

06 198903

District

FRANKLIN 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.5%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 80.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 83.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

198903

06

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FRANKLIN 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 001904

FRANKSTON 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	46.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.2%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	20.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	40.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 81.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 74.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

on <u>07</u> No <u>001904</u>

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FRANKSTON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

13 086901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

FREDERICKSBURG 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	59.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.4%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular park. 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	41.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	25.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Stift / Daged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 086901

13

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FREDERICKSBURG 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Region County District No

02 066903

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District

FREER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.2%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 54.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 48.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

02 066903

District

FREER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____1

17 152907

District

FRENSHIP 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	86.1%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.6%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.6%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 and 15 and 15		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	10.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	8.7%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 64.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

152907

17

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District			FRENSHIP IS	D	
		1	r	1	1
	0	01-1-1	Of the Mark		LEA

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No C

04 084911

District

FRIENDSWOOD 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular and/r. 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.5%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	22.2%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 76.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 74.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region ____ County District No 04

084911

FRIENDSWOOD 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 State Performance Report Indicators Target		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 16 County District No 185903

FRIONA ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ls, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 82.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%/	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 16 County District No 185903

District

FRIONA 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to numbers level dat repo	a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 10 County District No 043905

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FRISCO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.4%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	1.6%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.6%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	20.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	22.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 80.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

District

10 043905

FRISCO ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 12 County District No 175905

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FROST 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	66.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region <u>12</u> County District No **175905**

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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

State

Target

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

10 days in a school year of children with

IEPs by race and ethnicity

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

LEA

Met

State

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

FRUITVALE ISD

State

Met

Target?

State

Rate

234909

LEA Met

State

Target?

data are not reported

LEA

Rate

District

State

Target

	-		Target?		Target?			-		Target?		Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	52.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.6%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	7.9%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 69.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 76.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level

07

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

07 234909

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FRUITVALE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

18 122901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FT DAVIS 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	070	120			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

18 122901

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

FT DAVIS 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

19 115901

District

FT HANCOCK 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved		≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	078	076	110			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 115901

19

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

20 015914

FT SAM HOUSTON ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	20.1%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.9%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	66.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	19.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, distric data are not rep	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, c	listrict level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	52.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		orroponou
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VES		VEC	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, c data are no	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	Due to numbers, c data are no	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region County District No 20

015914

FT SAM HOUSTON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

11 049901

District

GAINESVILLE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.6%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	35.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	42.9%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, distric data are not rep	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 59.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 48.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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% 0'	070	160				Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

IFA

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No

Region 11 049901

District	GAINESVILLE ISD									
/ Annual	State	State	State Met	LEA Bato	LEA Met					

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?
9 : Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No _____

04 101910

District

GALENA PARK 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.6%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	6.5%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.2%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	2.8%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	21.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 66.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	09/	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

ion <u>04</u> No **101910**

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GALENA PARK 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No

04 084902

District

GALVESTON 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	53.1%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	28.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	20.1%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	81.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 44.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 41.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		VEC	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%	TES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

No 084902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GALVESTON ISD

County District No	00

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

GANADO ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.1%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children agec with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	66.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 78.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

03 120902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____ County District No

t No 120902

03

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GA

GANADO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 0

10 057909

GARLAND 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	76.3%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	11.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	6.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	≥ 75% Math	Math	_		-	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	uala ale li	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	09/	09/	VES		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

10 057909

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GΑ	RLA	1D 19	SD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 11 County District No 184911

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GARNER 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	41.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	25.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	U76	TES		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 11 County District No 184911

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GARNER 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ______

07 174903

District

GARRISON 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	75.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	25.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 91.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 78.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	076	110		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

_ Region County District No

ion 07 No 174903

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GARRISON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no 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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

07 Region County District No 183904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GARY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 88.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 sta	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 07 County District No 183904

District

GARY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in 		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are r 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established targets under the approved conditional No Child Left Behind (NCLB) waiver for specific provisions. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies 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

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

IEPs by race and ethnicity

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

LEA

Met

State

Met

LEA

Region County District No

LEA

12 050902

LEA Met

State

GATESVILLE ISD

State

Met

State

District

State

		ruiget.		Target?					ruiger.		rurger.
78%	76.9%	NO	90.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.6%	NO
9%	11.2%	NO	3.2%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.0%	YES
00%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
ading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	57.1%	YES
95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	4.8%	YES
ath	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to	
95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, d data are no	
ading 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	7B : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	small

for children with disabilities

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?	et?		Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.2%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	57.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	4.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	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%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	60.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	- 0070	01.270	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	50.0%	NO		Statement 2	= 01 /0	00.070	120		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	070	120			Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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 hy race and ethnicity.	0%	0%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

gion <u>12</u> t No **050902**

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GATESVILLE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no 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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the tim they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 01 County District No 240801

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

GATEWAY ACADEMY CHARTER DISTRICT

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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	94.1%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	2.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 32.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 19.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

For information about the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 240801

01

GATEWAY ACADEMY CHARTER DISTRICT 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no 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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary $> 72\%$ 69% NO		number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted		

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

GATEWAY CHARTER ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	100%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading			≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 39.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VEC		VEC	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%	YES		YES		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

10 057831

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

Region 10 strict No 057831

District GAT

GATEWAY CHARTER 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	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no 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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 06 County District No 166902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GAUSE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	90.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IFDe who	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 06 County District No 166902

District

GAUSE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to sma numbers, dist level data are reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region ____ County District No

20 015802

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GEORGE GERVIN ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	89.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 /0			123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 015802

20

District

GEORGE GERVIN ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region04County District No101804

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GEORGE I SANCHEZ CHARTER

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.3%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	93.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	92.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 20.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 27.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	163		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 04 County District No 101804

GEORGE I SANCHEZ CHARTER

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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	Due to sm numbers, dis level data are reported		s, district a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____

02 149901

District

GEORGE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 61.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 149901

02

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GEORGE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69% NO number level dat		o small s, district a are not orted	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

13 246904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GEORGETOWN 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.2%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	39.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with UPDs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

13 County District No 246904

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GEORGETOWN 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	ES 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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% 59% 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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.≥ 72%69%		69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No _____1

12 161925

District

GHOLSON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with <i>I</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	93.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with UPP who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	076			160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

12 161925

District

GHOLSON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are n 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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are r 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%	99.7%	NO		YES			numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

13 144901

GIDDINGS ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	33.3%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.9%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	23.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	68.0%	NO	demonstrate improved						o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	56.0%	NO							
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	ES children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summ	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

13 144901

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GIDDINGS 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

07 Region County District No 230902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GILMER 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	58.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.2%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.2%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	20.8%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	with IEPs attending a separa	: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 th IEPs attending a separate special ucation class, separate school or sidential facility		17%	YES	25.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small listrict level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0%				7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small	
		0%	YES	ES	YES	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

07 230902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 101805

GIRLS & BOYS PREPARATORY ACADEMY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	56.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	1.4%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 40.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 33.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

04

For information about the State Performance Plan/ In Performance Popert, Public Poperting, Targets, visit: Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/ 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No 10

District GIRLS & BOYS PREPARATORY ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 3A, 4A-B, 9, 10, 11,12, and 13 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting in a given indicator, or were not analyzed due to data availability, are designated with N/A in the "LEA Rate" and/or "LEA Met State Target?" column.

Region 04 strict No 101805

Region County District No

07 092901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GLADEWATER 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	39.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.6%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.5%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	15.2%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	5.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	78.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	30.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	80.0%	NO	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 73.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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 76				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

07
092901

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GLADEWATER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	e State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

18 087901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GLASSCOCK 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	94.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 84.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 77.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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 76	123			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District Region 18 County District No 087901

District GL/

GLASSCOCK COUNTY 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GLEN ROSE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	82.4%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.9%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – r class less	≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.2%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	63.2%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	36.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

11 213901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____

tegion <u>11</u> ict No **213901**

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GLEN ROSE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to numbers level data repo	a are not
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 126911

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GODLEY 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	52.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	27.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

11

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region 11 County District No

126911

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GODLEY 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No _____1

09 169906

District

GOLD BURG 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.6%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 20.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

09 County District No 169906

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GOLE) BURG	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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 057835

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

GOLDEN RULE CHARTER SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

10

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

District

Region 10 County District No 057835

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

GOLDEN RULE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

12 167901

GOLDTHWAITE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recer majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 76.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

12 County District No 167901

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GOLDTHWAITE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 03 County District No

088902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GOLIAD 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.9%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	5.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	10.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 42.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 43.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

03 088902

District

GOLIAD 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

13 089901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GONZALES ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	44.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.3%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recer majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	48.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 66.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

13 089901

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

GONZALES IS	SD.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 187903

06

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GOODRICH ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	7.1%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recer majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

06 187903

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

GOODRICH ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

04 101911

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GOOSE CREEK CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	82.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.8%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.5%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	17.8%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	20.2%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 51.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076	TEO		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 101911

04

District

00005		~
GOOSE	CREEN	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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No 18

Targets District

GORDON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	94.0%	NO			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 81.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	U76	TEO		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

11 182901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

11 182901

District

GORDON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 1 County District No 067

GORMAN ISD

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

LEA State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA 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 ≥ 78% NO 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 76.9% 66% 40.6% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% 12.5% ≤ 10% 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 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.0% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES 0.0% NO Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special YES 95.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YES ≥ 95% 99% YES 100% skills (including social ≥ 61% 61.8% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate children aged 3 through 5 ≥ 80% 81.2% YES Statement 1 achievement standards with IEPs who Due to small ≥ 75% 59% NO 65.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 57.0% 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 YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary IEPs of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% 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

14 067904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

14 067904

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GORMAN 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

18 156905

GRADY ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 89.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	152		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 18 County District No 156905

District

GRADY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____ County District No ____1

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRAFORD 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	56.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	4.0%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 84.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 65.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	VES		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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

11 182902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

11 182902

District

GRAFORD 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to numbers level dat repo	a are not
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	YES 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ≥ 57% 59% YES		YES	Due to numbers level dat repo	a are not	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 252901

09

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRAHAM 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	8.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 44.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 38.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		VEO	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%	TES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____

gion 09 t No 252901

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRAHAM 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____1

District

11 111901

GRANBURY 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.8%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	16.2%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	25.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	d 3 through 5 Statement 1		81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 77.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 71.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	-	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
		0%	163		110	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____

County District No 111901

11

District

GRANBURY 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.	≥ 25% 27%		YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Region County District No

10 057910

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRAND PRAIRIE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	77.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.9%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – class less	≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	4.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	19.2%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 St	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 057910

10

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRAND PRAIRIE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to smal	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. ≥ 72% 69%		NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted		

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

07 234904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRAND SALINE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	81.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	58.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.2%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	11.1%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	40.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	93.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 43.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, dist data are not	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 s	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 78			YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level lot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

07 234904

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRAND SALINE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____

18 238904

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRANDFALLS-ROYALTY 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.1%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 55.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 76	115		YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 18

County District No 238904

District

GRANDFALLS-ROYALTY 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRANDVIEW 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	52.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	81.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 69.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 79.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 76				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

11 126904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

on <u>11</u> Io <u>126904</u>

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRANDVIEW 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region ____ County District No

16 090905

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRANDVIEW-HOPKINS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	N/A	N/A
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	N/A	N/A
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	N/A	N/A
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	N/A	N/A	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	N/A	N/A	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading N/A	Reading N/A	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math N/A	Math N/A	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	A 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 /0				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 090905

16

District

GRANDVIEW-HOPKINS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

13 246905

District

GRANGER 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 86.0%	Math knowledge and chille	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported			
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Stift / Downley	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0 78	123			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region _____

legion 13 ict No 246905

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRANGER 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

LEA

Region County District No

15 226907

GRAPE CREEK ISD

 •••	TTOO.

District

ual rs	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate
d 6				

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	41.2%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	52.9%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

n <u>15</u> o **226907**

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRAPE CREEK 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

06 113902

GRAPELAND 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	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%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	53.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1			_		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	44.0%	NO		Statement 2	- 01 /0	00.070	120		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

06 113902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GR	AND	חפו	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

220906

District

GRAPEVINE-COLLEYVILLE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	74.2%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	8.1%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	34.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	21.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 69.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to sma	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

11

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

 Region
 11

 strict No
 220906

District GR

GRAPEVINE-COLLEYVILLE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GREENVILLE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	14.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		listrict level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

10 116905

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region

County District No 116905

10

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GREENVILLE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

18 165902

District

GREENWOOD 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	71.4%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	76.9%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 52.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	076	TEO		TES	YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

18 County District No 165902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

G	RFI	FNV	NO	OD	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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region ____ County District No

02 205902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GREGORY-PORTLAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	79.2%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.4%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	7.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 61.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	070				YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

ion 02 No 205902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GREGORY-PORTLAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No

12 147902

District

GROESBECK 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	81.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	7.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	Math acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2 ≥ 57%		≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

12 County District No 147902

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GROESBECK 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 16 County District No 033901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GROOM ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.1%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 16 County District No 033901

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GROOM ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

State

Target

≥ 78%

0%

0%

YES

State

Rate

76.9%

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

LEA

Met

State

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

GROVETON ISD

State

Met

Target?

State

Rate

LEA Met

State

Target?

NO

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

LEA

Rate

State

Target

≥ 76%

77.6%

YES

Target?	nute	Target?		ranger	Nuto	Target?	nute
NO	75.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.5%
NO	25.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.7%
NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%
Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%
YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%
			7A: Percent of preschool				

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	25.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.7%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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	070			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a						8: Percent of parents with a	child receiving				Duo tr	cmall

YES

06 228901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

ion 06 No 228901

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GROVETON 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

16 098901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRUVER 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	91.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	94.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 90.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 83.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

16 098901

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GRUVER 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 10 County District No 091917

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GUNTER 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.5%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	66.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 79.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math YES	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool Summary children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary statement 2 Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES			≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region 10 County District No

091917

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GUNTER 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

one year of leaving high school.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 04

14 047903

District

GUSTINE 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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	5.0%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	94.0%	NO	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	94.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 44.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

14 047903

District

GUSTINE 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.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

GUTHRIE CSD

17 135001

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	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due tr	o small
	≥ 75%	59%	NO	100%	YES	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	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%	YES		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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	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%	YES		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%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region 17 County District No

135001

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

GUTHRIE CSD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	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%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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%	59%	YES	numbers	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%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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