Region County District No

17 095903

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

HALE CENTER 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

n <u>17</u> o **095903** 

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

District

HALE CENTER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 03 143901

District

HALLETTSVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	92.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.7%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	14.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	14.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	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 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	076	0 /6	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 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 143901

District

HALLETTSVILLE ISD

-	
I I FTTSVII	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 161924

District

HALLSBURG ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 71.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

tegion <u>12</u> ict No **161924** 

reported

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

District

HALLSBURG ISD

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

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

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

HALLSVILLE 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	91.4%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	2.9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	8.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	17.1%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> 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 73.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

07 102904

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

Region County District No

07 102904

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

District

HALLSVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 097902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	70.6%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 85.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> 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 73.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

trict No 097902

12

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

District

HAMILTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 14 County District No 127903

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

HAMLIN 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?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 78	0 78				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

14 County District No 127903

District

HAMLIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 123914

05

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

HAMSHIRE-FANNETT 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	70.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.4%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.8%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). <b>6B:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	TC: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEDa 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			123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 123914

05

HAMSHI

District

HAMSHIRE-FANNETT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 219901

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

HAPPY 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 85.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	00/	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 219901

District

HAPPY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 04 County District No 146904

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

HARDIN 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.3%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	rnajority 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	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

146904

District

HARDIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 100905

District

HARDIN-JEFFERSON 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	82.4%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	11.8%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	75.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 65.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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	078	123		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 100905

05

District HA

HARDIN-JEFFERSON ISD

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

0%

0%

YES

YES

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

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

LEA

Met

State

LEA

Region County District No

015904

LEA Met

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

LEA

HARLANDALE ISD

State

District

State

≥ 76%

77.6%

YES

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	71.2%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	15.3%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – r class less	≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.3%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.8%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	19.7%	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	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math		≥ 57%	50.00/	YES		district level ot reported	
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	38.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 57%	58.9%	TES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than the rate bill determine achieved the achieved the set of the set o	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	
suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with EPs						demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	data are n	ot reported

20

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

Region

County District No 015904

20

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

District

HARLANDALE ISD

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

07 102905

HARLETON 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	83.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with 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	16.7%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood 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	<b>7A</b> : 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 65.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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	0 70				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 102905

07

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

District

HARLETON ISD

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

01 031903

District

HARLINGEN 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	71.7%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	59.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 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		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ls, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	16.2%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	1.0%	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	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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 47.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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	120		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	, -	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

01

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

District

HARLINGEN 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	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

07 230905

District

HARMONY 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.1%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 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		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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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 numbers, district leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 /0	123			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

egion 07 ct No 230905

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

District

HARMONY ISD

ounty	District	INO

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

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No

Region

HARMONY SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	1.5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 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		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

04 101858

#### 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 101858

District

HARMONY SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE

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

Region County District No 101862

HARMONY SCHOOL OF SCIENCE - HOUSTON

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	84.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.1%	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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading			≥ 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		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 45.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	001	VEC		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

04

#### 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 04 County District No 101862

District HARMONY SCHOOL OF SCIENCE - HOUSTON

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 071806

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

District HARMONY SCIENCE ACAD (EL PASO)

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	≥ 75%	56%	NO	62.0%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0,0	. 20		. 20	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

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 071806

District HARMONY SCIENCE ACAD (EL PASO)

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 220813

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

HARMONY SCIENCE ACAD (FORT WORTH) 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.8%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	%     YES     100%     YES     6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 3 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	children aged 3 through 5 vith IEPs who Statement 1		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	numbers, distri data are not re	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small		
	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	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	09/	0% 0% YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
	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	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 lev data are not reporte	

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 220813

District HARMONY SCIENCE ACAD (FORT WORTH)

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

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 152805

17

HARMONY SCIENCE ACAD (LUBBOCK)

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	<b>6B:</b> 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     ************************************		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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 33.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	C 7C: Percent of preschool Sur children aged 3 through 5 State	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 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 152805

HARMONY SCIENCE ACAD (LUBBOCK) District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 015828

HARMONY SCIENCE ACAD (SAN ANTONIO) District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	1.9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 sta	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	076	160		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

20

## ance Plan/ 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 0

District HARMONY SCIENCE ACAD (SAN ANTONIO)

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

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 20 strict No 015828

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

Region12County District No161807

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

HARMONY SCIENCE ACAD (WACO)

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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	1.9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	7 6 7 (7		≤ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 161807

District

HARMONY SCIENCE ACAD (WACO)

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

LEA

State

Region County District No

District

HARMONY SCIENCE ACADEMY

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	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's 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
<b>3B</b> : 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	<b>6B</b> : 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 45.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	078	078	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

101846

LEA Met

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

Region 04 County District No 101846

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

District

HARMONY SCIENCE ACADEMY

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

ofile

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region01County District No031803

District HARMONY SCIENCE ACADEMY - BROWNSVILLE

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a 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	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 45.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0%	VES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 01 County District No 031803

District HARMONY SCIENCE ACADEMY - BROWNSVILLE

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

HARMONY SCIENCE ACADEMY (AUSTIN)

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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

<u>13</u> 227816

## 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 13 County District No 227816

District HARMONY SCIENCE ACADEMY (AUSTIN)

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

13 086902

District

HARPER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	te State Performance Plan/ 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	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	program; and (b).         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	12.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 70.0%	Math NO	Active Ac		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

13 086902

District

HARPER ISD

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

09 244901

HARROLD ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Ann Performance Report Indicate 5A: Percent of children with IEPs age		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 85.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> 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	ES demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Sun		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES <b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES				≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

09 244901

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

District

HARROLD ISD

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

one year of leaving high school.

Region County District No 035902

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

HART 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	16.7%	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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	TC: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Sum     Sum	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		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

16

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

Region 16 County District No

035902

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

District

HART ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 103902

16

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

HARTLEY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b). <b>6B:</b> 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		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

16 103902

District

HARTLEY ISD

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

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

Region County District No

HARTS BLUFF ISD

80 225907

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	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A			≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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, positive social-emotional         Summa Statemen		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	Children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved		≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· ·	ot reported	

Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	children aged 3 through 5	Summary	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	
≥ 75%	59%	NO	64.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement				Due to small numbers, district level
Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	> E70/	E9 00/	VES	data are not reported
≥ 75%	56%	NO	64.0%	NO	-	Statement 2	2 57 %	50.9%	TE3	
0%	0%	VES		VES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level
078	0%	123		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	data are not reported
0%	0%	YES		YES	special education services will schools facilitated parent invo	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported
	≥ 75% Math ≥ 75%	≥ 75%     59%       Math     Math       ≥ 75%     56%       0%     0%	≥ 75%     59%     NO       Math     Math     Math       ≥ 75%     56%     NO       0%     0%     YES	≥ 75%     59%     NO     64.0%       Math     Math     Math     Math       ≥ 75%     56%     NO     64.0%       0%     0%     YES	≥ 75%       59%       NO       64.0%       NO         Math       Math       Math       Math       Math         ≥ 75%       56%       NO       64.0%       NO         0%       0%       YES       YES       YES	$\geq 75\%$ $59\%$ NO $64.0\%$ NOwith IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills $Math$ MathMathMathMathMath $\geq 75\%$ $56\%$ NO $64.0\%$ NO $recent or constraints improvedacquisition and use ofknowledge and skills0\%0\%YESYESTC: Percent of preschoolchildren aged 3 through 5with IEPs whodemonstrate improved useof appropriate behaviors tomeet their needs0\%0\%YESYESS: Percent of parents with a orspecial education services with a orspecial education servicesmeans of improving services$	≥ 75%       59%       NO       64.0%       NO       children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills       Summary Statement 1         Math       Math       Math       Math       Math       Math       Math       Summary Statement 1         ≥ 75%       56%       NO       64.0%       NO       Response       Summary Statement 2         0%       0%       YES       YES       YES       YES       Summary Statement 1         0%       0%       YES       YES       YES       Summary Statement 2         0%       0%       YES       YES       Summary Statement 2         0%       0%       YES       YES       Summary Statement 2	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\frac{2}{75\%} = \frac{1}{59\%} = \frac{1}{N0} = \frac{1}{64.0\%} = \frac{1}{N0} = \frac{1}{64.0\%} = \frac{1}{N0} = \frac{1}{100} = 1$

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

Region County District No

on 08 lo 225907

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

District

HARTS BLUFF ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	of 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
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 104901

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)

District

HASKELL CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	83.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	00/	VES		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Stateme	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

14 104901

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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

07 250902

http://www.tea.state.tx.us/s	pecial.ed/	<b>,</b> ,	of Peri			rmance Plan Indicator Targ ar 2012 (2012-13)	jets Dist	rict		HAWKINS	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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	14.3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 43.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	TEG		demonstrate improved use	YES		not reported				
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 rolvement 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

07 250902

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

District

н	KIN	121	SD

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

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

Region 127904 County District No

HAWLEY 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 YES 76.9% 66% 86.2% 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 YES ≤ 10% 14% 4.6% 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 100% YES 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 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 62.0% 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 49.0% 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

for children with disabilities

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 127904

District

HAWLEY ISD

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

13 Region County District No

105906

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

HAYS 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?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	82.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	8.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	16.5%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	15.2%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to numbers, c	o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	numbers, c data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to numbers, o	o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	070	123		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

#### 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>13</u> County District No **105906** 

HAYS CISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 19

06 198905

District	HEARNE 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	82.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.4%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> 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	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	12.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	163		163	YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

egion 06 ct No 198905

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

District

**HEARNE ISD** 

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

16 065902

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

HEDLEY 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 76				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 065902

District

**HEDLEY ISD** 

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

HEMPHILL ISD

07 202903

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	80.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.1%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	44.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sci residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	
	≥ 75%	59%	NO	77.0%	YES	demonstrate improved					Due to small numbers, district leve	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO		Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are not repo	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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	070			163			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district l data are not repo	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 202903

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

District

Biother No	
HEMPHILL ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 237902

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)

District

HEMPSTEAD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	96.2%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.1%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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 ving the and related	≥ 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 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	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

04 237902

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

District

HEMPSTEAD 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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 201902

HENDERSON ISD

District

е	State	State Met	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?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	97.1%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.4%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	30.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 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	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	076	076	TEO		163	demostrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

07 201902

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

District

HEN	<b>JDEF</b>	RSON	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	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time		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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

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)

LEA

Met

State

Met

LEA

Region County District No

State

Met

09 039902

LEA Met

State

**HENRIETTA ISD** 

State

District

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

LEA

Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?	Performance Report		Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	Sta Targ
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.2%	N
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.7%	YE
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YI
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	42.9%	Y
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	Y
	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	Due to numbers, c	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	data are n	
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are n	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to numbers, o	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		070			. 20	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	data are n	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 numbers, o data are n	district

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

Region

County District No 039902

09

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

District

HENRIETTA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Annual te Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) 
 Region
 20

 County District No
 015833

 HENRY FORD ACADEMY ALAMEDA SCHOOL FOR

 District
 ART + DESIGN

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> 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
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

#### 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

 County District No
 015833

 HENRY FORD ACADEMY ALAMEDA SCHOOL FOR

 District
 ART + DESIGN

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

HEREFORD ISD

16 059901

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	84.4%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	3.1%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	39.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	17.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

gion <u>16</u> t No **059901** 

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

District

HEREFORD ISD

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

14 208901

HERMLEIGH 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥68%	66%	NO	91.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.3%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	≥ 75%	59%	NO	56.0%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	001	VEC		VEO	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

gion <u>14</u> t No **208901** 

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

District

HERMLEIGH ISD

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

12 097903

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

**HICO 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 84.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	, -	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 12 County District No

097903

District

**HICO ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	level dat	s, district
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 108905

District

HIDALGO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	e State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	47.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.5%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.6%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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	57.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	42.9%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

01 108905

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

District

		-
HIDALGO	ISD	

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

0%

0%

YES

YES

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

4B: Percent of districts that have a

IEPs by race and ethnicity

significant discrepancy in the rate of

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

#### 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

**HIGGINS ISD** 

State

Met

State

148903

LEA Met

State

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

District

State

≥ 76%

77.6%

YES

Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?	Performance Report		Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	53.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	- 0070	01.270	120		o small district level
	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	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 /0	123			ES with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported	

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

16

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

Region County District No

16 148903

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

District

HIGGINS ISD

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

 County District No
 015803

 HIGGS CARTER KING GIFTED & TALENTED

 District
 CHARTER ACAD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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 UPDe 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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

#### 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 County District No 015803 HIGGS CARTER KING GIFTED & TALENTED CHARTER ACAD

District

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

Target

0%

0%

YES

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

4B: Percent of districts that have a

IEPs by race and ethnicity

significant discrepancy in the rate of

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

#### 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

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

LEA

Met

State

State

Met

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

LEA

Rate

084903

LEA Met

State

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

**HIGH ISLAND ISD** 

State

Met

District

State

Rate

State

Target

≥ 76%

77.6%

YES

Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Target?	Rale	Target?	Fenomance Report	indicators	Target	Rale	Target?	Rale	Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> 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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a region active</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	89.0%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	20070	01.270	120	Due to numbers, o	o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are n	
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	63.0%	NO		Statement 2	- 07 70	00.070	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to numbers, c	o small listrict 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

YES

05

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

Region

05 County District No 084903

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

District

HIGH ISLAND ISD

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

14 177905

District

HIGHLAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.1%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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	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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to sma	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 71.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

ict No 177905

14

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

District

HIGHLAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 057911

District

HIGHLAND 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	89.5%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> 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		YES	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	7.3%	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	43.9%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 85.0%	Math YES	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	120			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

10 County District No 057911

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

District

HIGHLAND 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	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 188903

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

HIGHLAND 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	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 72.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 188903

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

District

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

HILLSBORO 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	95.8%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.9%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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	56.0%	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	24.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 73.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 listrict level ot reported

12 109904

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

Region

12 County District No 109904

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

District

HILLSBORO ISD

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

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the 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

#### 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 084908

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

**HITCHCOCK 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	84.6%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	7.7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.3%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children agec 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	44.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	49.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 57 /0	50.970	110		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than the transformer is a subscript.	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs						demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	data are n	ot reported

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

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

Region County District No

04 084908

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

District

HIT	снсо	CK	ISD

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

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

HOLLAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.1%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	20.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	with IEPs attending a separa	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		17%	YES	60.0%	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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> 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 79.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%/	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%	of appropriate behaviors to Summa	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72% 73	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported				
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

12 014905

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

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

trict No 014905

12

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

District

HOLLAND ISD

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

09 Region County District No 005902

District

HOLLIDAY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool       Summary         children aged 3 through 5       Statement 1         with IEPs who       Statement 1         demonstrate improved,       positive social-emotional         skills (including social relationships)       Statement 2		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 Summar	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	123		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

09 005902

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

HOLLIDAY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 20 County District No 163904

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

HONDO 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	86.4%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	9.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.5%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	42.1%	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	5.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : 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	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

20 163904

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

District

HONDO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 10 074907

District

HONEY GROVE 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	11.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.9%	NO
<b>3B:</b> 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	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 45.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0 78	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

10 County District No 074907

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

District

HONEY	GROVE ISD	

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

10 057825

District

HONORS 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	90.9%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	9.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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	160		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

10 057825

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

District

HO	NORS	ACA	DEMY

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

Region 019902 County District No

HOOKS 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 88.9% YES ≥ 68% NO 76.9% 66% 33.7% 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 ≤ 10% 14% 19.1% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1% 1.1% 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 66.7% YES 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 97.0% YES ≤ 17% 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 33.3% 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 80.0% YES 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

08

#### 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

08 019902

District

HOOKS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 04 County District No 101812

HOUSTON CAN 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	40.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	38.2%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	87.0%	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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 26.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%/	VES		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%	YES		TES	demostrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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) Region 04 County District No 101812

District HOUSTON CAN ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

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

Region04County District No101828

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

HOUSTON GATEWAY 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	19.6%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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	0%	0%	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

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

District

HOUSTON	GATEWAY	ACADEMY INC

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 101821

District HOUSTON HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 78.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0 76	110		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 04

County District No 101821

HOUSTON HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL

District

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

Note: Areas which are graved 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.

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

## 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)

Region04County District No101829

District HOUSTON HEIGHTS LEARNING ACADEMY INC

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	0.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

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 04 County District No 101829

District HOUSTON HEIGHTS LEARNING ACADEMY INC

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators ?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 04 County District No 101912

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

HOUSTON 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	61.1%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>i</i> 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	24.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	20.6%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6-21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading		r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	14.9%	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	24.6%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

04 101912

District

HOUSTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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/.

4A: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

IEPs

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

10 days in a school year for children with

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

Region 091905 County District No

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

District

HOWE ISD 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 YES 76.9% 66% 80.7% 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 ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% NO 13.3% ≤ 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 "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 2.4% NO 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 50.0% YES 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 YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 98.0% 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 98.0% 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 67.0% 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 67.0% NO

7C: Percent of preschool

children aged 3 through 5

demonstrate improved use

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

with IEPs who

meet their needs

YES

YES

YES

YES

0%

0%

0%

0%

Summary

Statement 1

Summary

Statement 2

≥ 81%

≥ 72%

≥ 76%

82.7%

73.2%

77.6%

YES

YES

YES

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

10

#### 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 091905

District

HOWE ISD

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

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating

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

5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

LEA

Met

State

Target?

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

LEA

Rate

019913

LEA Met

State

Target?

data are not reported

HUBBARD ISD

State

Met

Target?

State

Rate

District

State

Target

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	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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	data are no	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	,	0.11270	0		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are no	
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	80.0%	YES		Statement 2	2 37 70	30.378	110		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	TES		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services	ho report that volvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level

08

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

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

gion 08 t No 019913

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

District

HUBBARD ISD

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

12 109905

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

HUBBARD 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	59.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6-21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.1%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

rict No 109905

12

District

HUBBARD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9</b> : Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10</b> : Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	who are no longer in LEPs in effect at the time ere enrolled in higher yely employed within one ≥ 57% 59% YES level data		s, district ta are not		
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		they left school, and were enrolled in higher		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 072908

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)

District

HUCKABAY 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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). <b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	S demonstrate improved demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Si	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

on <u>11</u> No **072908** 

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

District

HUCKABAY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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				Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not			
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 00

07 003902

County District No HUDSON 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	71.4%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	83.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	19.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a constant and in the service.</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	45.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 79.0%	Math YES	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

07 003902

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

HUDSON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	t at the time n higher ondary ≥ 72% 69% NO level da mpetitively		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 101925

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

HUFFMAN 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	92.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.2%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	45.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	36.4%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 45.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

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

ict No 101925

04

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

District

HUFFMAN ISD

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

80 034903

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

HUGHES SPRINGS 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.1%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	7.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	38.5%	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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 82.0%	Math YES	S demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Su	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES <b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		163		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 small district level lot reported

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

Region

County District No 034903

08

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

District

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

05 146905

District

HULL-DAISETTA 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 te Performance Report Indicate		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.0%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	NO       7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs       Summary Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 /0			163		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

05 County District No 146905

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

District

HULL-DAISETTA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 101913

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

HUMBLE 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	75.4%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.8%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.1%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	14.8%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	16.4%	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	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		listrict level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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 listrict 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
<b>4A:</b> 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 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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

04

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

Region 04 County District No 101913

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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 133902

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

HUNT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 - 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 91.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

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

133902

20

District

HUNT ISD

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

## 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 003904

HUNTINGTON 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	90.5%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.8%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	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	55.6%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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 numbers, district leve	
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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

07 003904

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

District

н	IN	TIN	٩G	тο	N	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 County District No

06 236902

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)

HUNTSVILLE 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	80.5%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.7%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.1%	NO
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	85.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	160		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 06 No 236902

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

District

HUNTSVILLE ISD

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

<u>11</u> 220916

District

HURST-EULESS-BEDFORD 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?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	89.4%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	1.5%	YES	<b>5B:</b> 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		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	19.9%	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	13.9%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 72.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with LEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TEG	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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) District Region 11 County District No 220916

HURST-EULESS-BEDFORD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<ul> <li>13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs</li> <li>14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary and IEPs in offect of the time.</li> </ul>		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 246906

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

HUTTO 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.7%	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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6-21, served in separate schools, residentia facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early.</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	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	27.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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, 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

13 246906

District

HUTTO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs <b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 17 County District No 152910

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

IDALOU 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.1%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 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	33.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 70.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 17 County District No 152910

District

**IDALOU ISD** 

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

IDEA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

District

108807

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

01

#### 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 108807

01

District

IDEA PUBLIC 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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 01 County District No 108801 IGNITE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SERVICE CENTER

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	39.5%	NO			≥ 68%	66%	NO	97.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	18.6%	NO			≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	82.0%	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 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 25.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report the		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev data are not reporte	

#### 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 108801 IGNITE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SERVICE CENTER

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 043801 IMAGINE INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF NORTH TEXAS 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	N/A	N/A
<b>3B:</b> 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 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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 69.0%	Math NO	ES demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		not reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 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 10 County District No 043801 IMAGINE INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF NORTH TEXAS

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 120905

03

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

INDUSTRIAL 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.0%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	83.3%	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	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 small district level ot reported

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

Region

County District No 120905

03

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

District

INDUSTRIAL ISD

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

02 205903

District

INGLESIDE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t e State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators et? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	94.7%	YES	<ul> <li>5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</li> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6</li> </ul>		≥ 68%	66%	NO	57.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.9%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	52.6%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	36.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 45.0%	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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 /8	110		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	, -	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receivin 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	Due to small numbers, district lev data are not reporte	

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

Region County District No

02 205903

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

District

INGL	_ESI	DE	ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 133904

**INGRAM ISD** 

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

District

			1	1	1					1	1	
State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.2%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 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	20.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than			VE0			<b>7C:</b> 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		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 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 133904

20

District

INGRAM ISD

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

057830

INSPIRED VISION ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	te State Performance Plan/ Ann Performance Report Indicate		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	89.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	brogram; and (b). <b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	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 district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 057830

10

District

**INSPIRED VISION ACADEMY** 

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

06 093903

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

IOLA 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<i>majority of special education and related</i> services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). <b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 81.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 06 County District No

093903

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

**IOLA ISD** 

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

243903

IOWA PARK 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	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	57.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	9.5%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	14.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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		listrict level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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 48.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 stat	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	,	listrict level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

09

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

Region County District No

09 243903

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

District

IOWA PARK CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 14 County District No 208903

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

IRA 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childrend program and regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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 <b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	ES <b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

14 208903

District

**IRA ISD** 

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

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

**IRAAN-SHEFFIELD 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	93.0%	NO	<b>6B</b> : 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
	≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	076	0 76	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

18 186903

#### 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 186903

18

District

IRAAN-SHEFFIELD ISD

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

12 Region County District No 018906

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

IREDELL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	25.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	25.0%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	100%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 09	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
		0 %	1123			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Stateme		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 12 County District No 018906

District

**IREDELL ISD** 

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

15 118902

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)

**IRION COUNTY ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

15 County District No 118902

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

District

IRION	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 t?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

**IRVING 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?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.9%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	8.1%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.2%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early children age the second school and th</li></ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.2%	NO
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	8.6%	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	21.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		0.01				with IFDs 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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 057912

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

Region 10 County District No 057912

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?	Alet         State Performance Plan/ Annual           tate         Performance Report Indicators           rget?         Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 10 County District No 070907

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

ITALY 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	22.4%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	20.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	20.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 70.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with ICPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
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	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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, 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 070907

ounty District No

District

ITALY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 109907

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

ITASCA 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	9.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.5%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early shift be demonstrated in the scheme and the schem</li></ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading			≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	60.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

12

#### 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

109907

District

**ITASCA ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 \_\_\_\_1

09 119902

District

JACKSBORO 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.1%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early children agent the service of the</li></ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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 49.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 lot reported

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

Region County District No

ion 09 No 119902

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

District

JACKSBORO ISD

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

Region County District No

JACKSONVILLE ISD

07 037904

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	88.6%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	8.6%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.6%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	54.5%	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	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	97.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VES		VER	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEDa 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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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)

County District No

District

Region 07 strict No 037904

JACKSONVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 04 County District No 101822

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

District JAMIE'S HOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	22.2%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	77.8%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	80.0%	NO	<b>6B:</b> 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 demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	88.0%	NO	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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
	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	,	listrict level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	076	U76	TEO		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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, 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 101822

04

District

	JAMIE'S	HOUSE	CHARTER	SCHOO
--	---------	-------	---------	-------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 246907

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

JARRELL 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	71.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

13 246907

District

JARRELL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 121904 County District No

JASPER 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 YES ≥ 68% NO 76.9% 90.0% 66% 54.8% 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 11.7% ≤ 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% 1.1% 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 75.0% YES 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 99.0% 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 98.0% 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 50.0% 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

05

#### 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 121904

District

JASPER ISD

05

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

17 132902

District

**JAYTON-GIRARD 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	93.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 76			163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

17 132902

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

District

JAYTON-GIRARD	ISD

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

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

JEAN MASSIEU 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	0.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	55.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		orrepondu
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 057819

#### 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 057819

District

JEAN MASSIEU ACADEMY

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

80 155901

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

JEFFERSON 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	92.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	7.7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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	10.0%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	Math acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TEO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 08 No 155901

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

District

JEFFERSON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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 s numbers, o level data a reporte		s, district a are not	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES education or in some other hostsecondary 27.7% 64% N()		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

01 124901

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

JIM HOGG 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	55.6%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	33.3%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	75.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	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 who       Summary Statement 1		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 65.0%	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		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	0 /0					≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 124901

01

District

JIM HOGG 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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

14 221911

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

JIM NED 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	77.8%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	11.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	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         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 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with LEDs 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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

Region County District No

14 221911

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

JIM NED CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 210902

JOAQUIN 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?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	63.6%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	60.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	18.2%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – r class less	≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.9%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	71.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 82.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with US who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES with teps with demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2 ≥ 72% 73.2%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported			
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

07

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

Region County District No

07 210902

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

District

JOAQUIN ISD

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

\_\_\_\_\_

District JOHN H WOOD JR PUBLIC CHARTER 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	56.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.1%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	rnajority 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	95.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 31.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 plvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Region 20 County District No 015808

#### 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 015808

20

JOHN H WOOD JR PUBLIC 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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

13 016901

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

JOHNSON 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		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.4%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	22.2%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	77.8%	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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool SL 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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

13 016901

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

District

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

12 050909

District

JONESBORO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	0.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	91.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
		070	123			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

Region County District No

12 050909

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

District

JONESBORO ISD

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

126905

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

District

JOSHUA 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	41.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	1.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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
<b>3C:</b> 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 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 <u>11</u> County District No **126905** 

JOSHUA ISD

District

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

### 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

007902

JOURDANTON 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	88.9%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	11.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular 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		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	97.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	IES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

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)

District

≥ 72%

69%

NO

Region 20 007902

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

County District No

JOURDANTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of nappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>0</b> : Percent of districts with isproportionate representation of racial nd ethnic groups in specific disability ategories that is the result of nappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
1: Percent of children who were valuated within 60 days of receiving arental consent for initial evaluation or, i the State establishes a timeframe vithin which the evaluation must be onducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for						<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time				Due to	o small

YES

#### About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

100%

99.7%

NO

Part B, and who have an IEP developed

and implemented by their third birthdays

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

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C 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/.

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

education or training program; or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

education or in some other postsecondary

one year of leaving high school.

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

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

JUAN B GALAVIZ CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	100%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

04 101852

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

Region 04

101852

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	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       ≥ 57%       59%       YES       Du num level		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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/.

Note: Areas which are graved 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.

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

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)

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

20 015822

District

JUBILEE ACADEMIC CENTER

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 /0				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 015822

20

District JUBILEE

JUBILEE ACADEMIC CENTER

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES <b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 015916

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

JUDSON 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	69.1%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>I</i> 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	19.4%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 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		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ls, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.5%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li><i>majority of special education and related</i> services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li><i>6B:</i> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	40.9%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	17.5%	NO
	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	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

20 015916

District

JUDSON ISD

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

15 134901

District

JUNCTION 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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 70.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

15 134901

District

JUNCTION ISD

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

07 102901

KARNACK ISD

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 I		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0%				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 small district level ot reported

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

Region County District No

07 102901

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

District

•		
KARNACK	ISD	

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District

KARNES 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?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.5%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	9.1%	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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

03 128901

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

Region

03 County District No 128901

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

District

**KARNES 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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 105801

District

**KATHERINE ANNE PORTER SCHOOL** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	50.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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 ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

13

#### 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 105801

13

District KATHERINE ANNE PORTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	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 04 County District No 101914

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

KATY 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	78.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	6.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.0%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	15.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through		≤ 17%	17%	YES	41.2%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 70.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 04 County District No 101914

District

KATY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	,
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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/.

#### 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 129903

District

KAUFMAN 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	87.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	placements <b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and specifying the		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	14.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b). <b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	22.9%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 lot reported

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

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

egion <u>10</u> et No <u>129903</u>

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

District

KAUFMAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 126906

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

**KEENE 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	62.5%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.2%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.4%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 70.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 11 County District No

126906

District

**KEENE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 220907

District

**KELLER 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	85.9%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	2.8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 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		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	11.8%	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         7A: Percent of preschool         children aged 3 through 5         with IEPs who		≤ 17%	17%	YES	36.1%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	C 7C: Percent of preschool Sumr children aged 3 through 5 Staten	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U76	0%	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 11 County District No 220907

District

**KELLER ISD** 

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

242905

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

KELTON 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	83.0%	NO	<b>6B:</b> 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	83.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

 Region
 16

 strict No
 242905

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

District

KELTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to numbers level dat repo	a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 10 County District No 129904

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

KEMP 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	49.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.7%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.0%	NO
<b>3B:</b> 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	90.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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 Stateme	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 10 County District No 129904

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

District

KEMP ISD

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

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

KENEDY COUNTY WIDE CSD

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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	<b>7A</b> : 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 100%	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         7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to         Sun State	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	078	120				Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

02 131001

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

County District No 131001

Region

02

District KI

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

128902

**KENEDY 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	83.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	16.7%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.5%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95% 98% YES 1		100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	TC: Percent of preschool Sun 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	0%	0%	TES		YES with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported		
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

03

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

Region County District No

03 128902

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

District

**KENEDY ISD** 

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

06 113906

**KENNARD 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	90.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						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		YES		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 \_\_\_\_\_

gion <u>06</u> t No **113906** 

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

District

KENNARD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 220914

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)

District

KENNEDALE 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	94.4%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early		≥ 30%	31%	YES	20.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	31.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

11 220914

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

District

**KENNEDALE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 175907

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

**KERENS 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular 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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early children aper the server man description the server man description.</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	U%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 12 County District No

175907

District

**KERENS ISD** 

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

18 248901

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

KERMIT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.1%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early		≥ 30%	31%	YES	57.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	23.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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		listrict level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	078	120			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

18 248901

District

KERMIT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 133903

District

KERRVILLE 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	91.5%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.2%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	82.6%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	brogram; and (b). <b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 /0				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

egion 20 ict No 133903

District

**KERRVILLE ISD** 

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

07 092902

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

KILGORE 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	87.9%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	12.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.0%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early children aged a school of the school of t</li></ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 76	115		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

07 092902

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

District

-	
KILGORE ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 014906

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

KILLEEN 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	73.8%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with I through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.3%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and vaccining the</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early		≥ 30%	31%	YES	11.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	7 3 7 77		≤ 17%	17%	YES	13.1%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

12

#### 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 014906

District

**KILLEEN ISD** 

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

10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

Region County District No

137901

**KINGSVILLE ISD** 

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	40.6%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	34.4%	NO	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	28.5%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	56.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	43.6%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 41.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> 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	th demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services	ho report that volvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

02

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 137901

02

District

KINGSVILLE ISD

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

District **KIPP AUSTIN PUBLIC SCHOOLS INC** 

State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	97.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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			≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 78.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 227820

#### 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 13 County District No 227820

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

0%

0%

YES

YES

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

LEA

Met

State

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

LEA

Rate

057837

LEA Met

State

Target?

**KIPP DALLAS-FORT WORTH** 

State

Met

Target?

State

Rate

District

State

Target

≥ 76%

77.6%

YES

numbers, district level

data are not reported

	Ŭ		Target?		Target?			Ū		Target?		Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 92.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> 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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of	0%	0%	VES		VES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w	ho report that	> 760/	77 60/	VES		small

10

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

Region County District No

n <u>10</u> o **057837** 

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

District

KIPP DALLAS-FORT WORTH

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 101813

District

**KIPP INC 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	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	94.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	96.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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
	≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070			125	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

04 101813

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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

#### 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

**KIPP SAN ANTONIO** 

State

Met

015826

LEA Met

State

State

District

State

Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Target?	Rate	State Target?	Performance Report	Indicators	Target	Rate	Target?	Rate	State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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	97.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B</b> : 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
<b>4A:</b> 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		≥ 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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

20

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

Region County District No

20 015826

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

District

KIPP SAN ANTONIO

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

0%

0%

YES

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

LEA

Met

State

Met

LEA

Region County District No

LEA

04

LEA Met

State

**KIPP SOUTHEAST HOUSTON** 

State

Met

State

District

State

≥ 76%

77.6%

YES

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	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	94.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.4%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	44.0%	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	43.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 37 70	00.070	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported					
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a						8: Percent of parents with a	•				Due to	s emall

YES

101860

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

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

Region County District No

on <u>04</u> lo **101860** 

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

District

KIPP SOUTHEAST HOUSTON

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

05 121905

KIRBYVILLE 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	78.6%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	74.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	91.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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 district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 ot reported

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

Region County District No

ion 05 No 121905

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

District

KIRBYVILLE CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<ul> <li>13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs</li> <li>14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in a stransition and set and the time.</li> </ul>		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 101915

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

**KLEIN 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?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	68.3%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	11.8%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.0%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.7%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a senarate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	34.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	24.2%	NO
	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	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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%	076	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

04

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

Region 04 County District No 101915

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

District

KLEIN ISD

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

17 058905

District

KLONDIKE 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	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		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 88.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 State	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

17 058905

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

District

**KLONDIKE ISD** 

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

Region 22 County District No 232

**KNIPPA 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% 76.9% NO 0.0% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 100% 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 ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% NO 0.0% 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 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 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 100% YES 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 100% YES 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

20 232901

#### 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 232901

District

**KNIPPA ISD** 

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

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

09 138902

District

KNOX CITY-O'BRIEN CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	93.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	23.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	30.8%	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	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	NO     7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs     Summary Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 138902

09

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

District

KNOX CITY-O'BRIEN CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	of 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
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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)

Region04County District No101863

District KOINONIA COMMUNITY LEARNING 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 69.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	00/	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 ste	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

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 04 County District No 101863

District KOINONIA COMMUNITY LEARNING ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 018907

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

KOPPERL 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	59.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	18.2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> 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			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

12

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

gion <u>12</u> t No **018907** 

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

District

KOPPERL ISD

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

100903

**KOUNTZE 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	1.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	76.9%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	7.7%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

05

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

05 100903

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

District

KOUNTZ	E ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 219905

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

**KRESS ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

16

#### 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 219905

District

KRESS ISD

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

KRUM 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

061905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State 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	55.6%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	11.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	58.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 74.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 <u>11</u> County District No 061905

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

District

KRUM ISD

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

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

10 057839

LEA Met

State

LEA

Rate

LA ACADEMIA DE ESTRELLAS

State

Met

State

Rate

District

State

Target

data are not reported

Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Target?	Rate	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	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	94.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	1.4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	63.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	2 00 /0	01.270	1123		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	51.0%	NO		Statement 2			_		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 down in a subset work of shifters with	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv moone of improving oppliant	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES		o small district level

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

Region County District No

n <u>10</u> o **057839** 

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

District

LA ACADEMIA DE ESTRELLAS

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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 101833

LA AMISTAD LOVE & LEARNING ACADEMY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	25.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> 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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	65.5%	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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

04

## 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 04 County District No 101833

District LA AMISTAD LOVE & LEARNING ACADEMY

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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 \_\_\_\_

19 071807

District

LA FE PREPARATORY SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> 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
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	92.0%	NO	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	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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	0 /0	0 /0				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

District

Region 19 County District No 071807

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

LA FE PREPARATORY SCHOOL

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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

District

LA FERIA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	72.4%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	13.8%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less 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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	71.0%	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	3.2%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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	<ul> <li>numbers, district level data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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	078	078	120		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

01 031905

#### 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 031905

District

LA FERIA ISD

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

#### 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

125906

LA GLORIA ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> 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
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district level data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	73% Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of						district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	83.0%	YES	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		·
<b>4A:</b> 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 Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

02

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

Region County District No

02 125906

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 Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	level dat	s, district
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 075902

LA GRANGE 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	72.7%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.1%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	78.9%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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	<b>7A:</b> 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	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> 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		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

gion <u>13</u> t No **075902** 

District

LA GRANGE ISD

County	District No	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 01 County District No 108912

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

LA JOYA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	66.4%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	19.1%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	15.4%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	2.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sci residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	12.3%	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	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 43.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B</b> : 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	numbers, c data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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	078	070	120		125	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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, 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

01 108912

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

District

LA JOYA ISD

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

04 084904

District

LA MARQUE 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	58.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.5%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.7%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li><b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with ICDs attending a constant passial.</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	71.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	listrict level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 41.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

04 084904

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

District

LA MARQUE ISD
---------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 101916

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

LA PORTE 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	89.5%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.1%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with UPDs attending a second to activity.</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	14.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	19.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 58.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

101916

District

LA PORTE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 254902

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)

District

LA PRYOR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	89.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with ICD0 etheration a constant</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	94.0%	NO			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

gion 20 t No 254902

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

District

LA PRYOR ISD

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

12 Region County District No 161906

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

LA VEGA 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.8%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with ICPo other ding a segret based.</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	25.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	16.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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		listrict level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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		listrict level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to numbers, c	o small
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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 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 County District No

12 161906

District

LA VEGA ISD

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

20 247903

LA VERNIA 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	89.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.1%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with LED ottomating a comparison provide</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	41.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
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		district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

gion 20 t No 247903

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

District

LA VERNIA ISD

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

01 108914

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

LA VILLA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	50.0%	NO	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	92.0%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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         demonstrate improved,         positive social-emotional         skills (including social         relationships)		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		to 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	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	children aged 3 through 5 Sta	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	pol year for children with demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summ	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported						
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

01 108914

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

LA VILLA ISD

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

20 015913

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

District

	Net Rate Met State									
State arget	State Rate		LEA Rate							

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	80.0%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	84.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.3%	NO
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>Thajority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility</li> <li>7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	66.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	23.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	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		Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level					
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070		110	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported		
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

egion 20 ct No 015913

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

District

LACKLAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10</b> : Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 227912

13

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

LAGO VISTA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.8%	NO
<b>3B:</b> 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	82.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	VES		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

13 227912

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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

11 061912

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

LAKE DALLAS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	57.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.5%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	13.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	31.8%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 61.0%	Math NO	th acquisition and use of knowledge and skills $\begin{array}{c} \text{Summary} \\ \text{Statement 2} \\ \text{Statement 2} \\ \text{Statement 2} \end{array} \geq 57\%  58.12\%$		58.9%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

gion <u>11</u> at No **061912** 

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

District

LAKE 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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

13 227913

District

LAKE TRAVIS 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	92.2%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.2%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	25.9%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	1.9%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 82.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	076	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

13 County District No 227913

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

LAKE WORTH ISD

11 220910

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators t?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	11.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.4%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	53.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES	04.070	YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	160		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

11 220910

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

District

	WORTH	חפו
LANE	WONTH	130

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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		

### 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 079901

District

LAMAR 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	78.4%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	6.4%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.2%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.7%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	31.6%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	5.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 58.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070			123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

04 079901

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

LAMAR CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 05

17 058906

District

LAMESA 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.7%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	70.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	20.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 45.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	VES		VES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

17 058906

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

District

	100
LAMESA	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 141901

12

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

LAMPASAS 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	97.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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	19.4%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	6.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

12 141901

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

District

LAMPASAS ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 057913

District

LANCASTER 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	90.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	2.3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.9%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	27.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	21.6%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 39.0%	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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

ct No 057913

10

District

LANCASTER ISD

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

## 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 201903

LANEVILLE 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	57.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	4.8%	NO
<b>3B</b> : 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 ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 \_\_\_\_\_

 07

 rict No
 201903

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

District

LANEVILLE ISD

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

07 107910

,

District	LAPOYNOR ISD
2.00.000	

State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	53.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.8%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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	20.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	20.0%	NO
	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
<b>3C:</b> 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		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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	VES		VEC	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	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 volvement 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

 Region
 07

 trict No
 107910

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

District

LAPOYNOR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 01 County District No 240901

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

LAREDO 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	69.8%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	43.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.7%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.6%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.1%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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	43.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	47.3%	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 listrict 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
<b>3C:</b> 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 55.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 listrict level ot reported

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

Region County District No 240901

01

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

District

LAREDO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 245901

LASARA 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?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.2%	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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	72.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 57 70	50.978	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	09/	YES		YES	children aged 3 through 5 S	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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

#### 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

245901

District

LASARA ISD

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

06 Region County District No 113905

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

LATEXO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.5%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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     ************************************		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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 45.0%	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	<b>7C:</b> 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	078	120		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

District

County District No 113905

06

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 185904

16

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

LAZBUDDIE 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	<b>6B:</b> 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
	≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 23.0%	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
<b>4A</b> : 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	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

gion <u>16</u> t No **185904** 

District

LAZBUDDIE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 10 County District No 061804

LEADERSHIP PREP 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	57.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	<b>6B</b> : 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	75.0%	YES	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	001	VEC		VEO	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 061804

LEADERSHIP PREP SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 193902

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

LEAKEY 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	<b>5A</b> : 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	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less 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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 42.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

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

District

20

193902

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

246913

District

LEANDER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	85.8%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	2.3%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.2%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.2%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	20.2%	NO
	≥ 95% 98% YES 99.0% YES 99.0% It is a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	33.8%	NO				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)     Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	160		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

13

#### 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 246913

District

LEANDER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 80 County District No 019914

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

LEARY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	<b>5A</b> : 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> 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
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TEO		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

019914 LEARY ISD

08

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 16 County District No 090902

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

LEFORS 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	076	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 090902

16

District

LEFORS ISD

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

10 057846

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

District

LEGACY PREPARATORY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	<b>6B:</b> 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 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

10 County District No 057846

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

District

LEGACY PREPARATORY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 187906

County District No

District

LEGGETT 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	50.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	50.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	program; and (b). <b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A</b> : 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 77.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0 78				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

06 187906

District

•	
LEGGETT ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 06 County District No 145911

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

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	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	20.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 06 County District No 145911

LEON ISD

District

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

10 074909

LEONARD 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.5%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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				,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	68.0%	NO	Knowledge and Skills	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 074909

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

District

LEONARD ISD

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

LEVELLAND 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	76.2%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	19.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.9%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	12.8%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	38.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	09/	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

17 110902

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

Region County District No

17 110902

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

District

LEVELLAND ISD

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

07 201904

LEVERETTS CHAPEL ISD

District

		1				I FA						
State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	45.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	92.0%	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	<b>7A:</b> 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	91.0%	NO	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		not reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	5.570/	50.00/			district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	90.0%	YES	·····	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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	070	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		not reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 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 07 County District No 201904

LEVERETTS CHAPEL ISD

District

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

LEWISVILLE 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	78.2%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.1%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.1%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.2%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	40.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	8.7%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A</b> : 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 68.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	076			160	YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statemen		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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, c	o small listrict level ot reported

11 061902

#### 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 061902

11

District

LEWISVILLE ISD

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

13 144902

or Largets District

LEXINGTON 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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 ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A</b> : 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	120		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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>13</u> t No **144902** 

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

L

LEXINGTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 246908

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)

LIBERTY HILL 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	71.4%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	54.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.1%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.6%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

Region

County District No 246908

13

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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 146906 County District No

LIBERTY 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% 76.9% NO 44.4% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 89.2% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 22.2% NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO NO 5.4% 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% 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 30.8% YES 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 99.0% YES ≤ 17% 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 15.4% 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 99.0% 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 59.0% 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 59.0% 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

04

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

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

District No 146906

04

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

District

LIBERTY ISD

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

Region County District No

80 019908

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

LIBERTY-EYLAU 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.7%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	45.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 45.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

08 019908

District

- 1	IB	FR	?T	(-F	ΥI	ΔIJ	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 057807

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

LIFE SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	95.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

10 057807

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?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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

015825

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

LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir 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	<b>6B:</b> 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 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B</b> : 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 YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

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 015825

District

LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL

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

07 212903

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

LINDALE 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	96.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.6%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	4.5%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	18.2%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 74.0%	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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEO	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

212903

07

District

LINDALE ISD

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

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 08 County District No 034905

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

District

LINDEN-KILDARE 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	60.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	20.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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 68.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 034905

08

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

District

LINDEN-KILDARE CISD

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

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No 04

11 049907

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

LINDSAY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.5%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)       Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	92.0%	NO			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	73.0%	NO		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	children aged 3 through 5 Statement with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to sma numbers, distric	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported				
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

11 049907

District

LINDSAY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 072909

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)

District

LINGLEVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	0.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 40.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Sun	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, di data are no		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VES		VES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0%	0%	0% YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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, c	o small district level ot reported	

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

11 072909

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

District

L	INGL	EVIL	LE	ISD
				100

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 111902

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

LIPAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators         t?         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	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.3%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attraction and the set of the</li></ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	<b>7A:</b> 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	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 11 County District No 111902

District

LIPAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<ul> <li>14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</li> </ul>		69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district 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 05 181908

District LITTLE CYPRESS-MAURICEVILLE CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	65.8%	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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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%	09/	VES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 181908

LITTLE CYPRESS-MAURICEVILLE CISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual itate Performance Report Indicators rget?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 11 County District No 061914

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

LITTLE ELM 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	90.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.2%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.9%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attording a regular activity.</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	36.9%	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         7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≤ 17%	17%	YES	16.9%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U76	076	TES		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

11 061914

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

District

LITTL	FF	IM	ISD	

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

LITTLEFIELD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators SA: 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	91.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – r class less	≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

17 140904

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

gion <u>17</u> : No **140904** 

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

District

LITTLEFIELD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 187907

LIVINGSTON 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?
<b>1</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	91.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	4.2%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.3%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early.</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	54.2%	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	37.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	52.0%	NO	70 0 4 4 4 4	Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 /8	TES		113	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 187907

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

LIVINGSTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 data 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 13 County District No 150901

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

LLANO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators SA: 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	83.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	46.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	31.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 78.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 13 County District No 150901

County I

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

District

LLANO ISD

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

#### 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 028902

District

LOCKHART 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	80.6%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.4%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	18.0%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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 ICDe 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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

13 028902

District

LOCKHART ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	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		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 077902

17

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

LOCKNEY 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 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		listrict level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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		listrict level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 County District No

17 077902

District

LOCKNEY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs <b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 160905

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

LOHN 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li><i>majority of special education and related</i> services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li><i>6B:</i> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 15 County District No 160905

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

District

LOHN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 s numbers, level data report		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 12 County District No 141902

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

LOMETA 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>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).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	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 <b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEO		VEO	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with 150 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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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 12 County District No

141902

District

LOMETA ISD

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

02 Region County District No 178906

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

LONDON 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	89.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> 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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	20.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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			≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> 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%	TES			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

egion 02 ct No 178906

District

LONDON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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 numbers, dist level data are reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	ool, had IEPs in effect at the time , and were enrolled in higher some other postsecondary ining program; or competitively some other employment within		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 116906

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

LONE OAK 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	54.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.4%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	0.0%	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	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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 74.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

10 116906

District

LONE OAK ISD

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

07 092903

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

LONGVIEW 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	86.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.6%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	19.9%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	42.2%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	18.6%	NO
	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 listrict 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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, 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

07 092903

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

District

LONGVIEW ISD

-
n

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

17 083902

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

LOOP 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.3%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 17 County District No 083902

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

District

LOOP ISD

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

LORAINE ISD

168902

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	50.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	50.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li><i>majority or special education and related</i> services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li><i>6B:</i> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 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 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	18.0%	NO	knowledge and skins	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 76	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

14 168902

District

LORAINE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 12 County District No 161907

District

LORENA 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	15.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.7%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	88.9%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b). <b>6B</b> : 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

Region 12 County District No

161907

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

District

LORENA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 054902

17

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

LORENZO 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.8%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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	11.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	22.2%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

Region County District No

17 054902

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

LORENZO ISD

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

01 031906

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

LOS FRESNOS 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	78.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	53.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.9%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	28.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	.0% YES <b>6B</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	23.6%	NO
	Math Math Math Math Math Math Children aged 3 through 5 Statemen		Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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 71.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
						demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

Region County District No

01 031906

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

District

LOS FRESNOS CISD

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

03 Region County District No 241906

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

LOUISE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a 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	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	<b>6B</b> : 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
	≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	, -	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 03 County District No 241906

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 10 County District No 043919

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

LOVEJOY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	47.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B</b> : 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	<b>7A:</b> 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	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with ICD 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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

10 043919

District

LOVEJOY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 113903

District

LOVELADY 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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 children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES <b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	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		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

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)

Region County District No

06 113903

District

LOVELADY ISD

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

LUBBOCK 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	64.8%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	21.4%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.5%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early children early</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	11.5%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	15.7%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with JED 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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

17 152901

#### 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 17 County District No 152901

District

LUBBOCK ISD

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

17 152906

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)

LUBBOCK-COOPER 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.6%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). <b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	45.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	18.2%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	NO         YES       7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 152906

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

District

LUBBOCK-COOPER ISD

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

14 127905

District

LUEDERS-AVOCA 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	92.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early children decision the set of the set</li></ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).</li> <li>6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with JED when	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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

Region

14 County District No 127905

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

LUEDERS-AVOCA ISD

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

07 Region County District No 003903

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

LUFKIN 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	82.6%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	45.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.9%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	22.2%	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	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	21.2%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	28.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 72.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summar		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

07 003903

District

LUFKIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 028903

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 I		State Target	State 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	<b>5A:</b> 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	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	<b>7A</b> : 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
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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 25.0%	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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 76	123		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summar Statemen		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 028903

13

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

District

LULING ISD

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

05 100907

LUMBERTON ISD

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	87.5%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	6.3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	23.1%	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	50.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved						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	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Stateme		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

05 100907

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

District

1	UMB	FRT	ON	ISD
				100

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	condary school, had IEPs in effect at the time ey left school, and were enrolled in higher lucation or competitively employed within one ≥ 57% 59% YES left		numbers	a are not	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 data 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/.

State

Target

≥ 78%

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

#### 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** 

5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6

through 21, served inside the regular class

80% or more of the day

LEA

Met

State

Target?

YES

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No 2

LEA

Rate

77.6%

14.0%

0.0%

100%

0.0%

State

Met

Target?

NO

NO

YES

01 245902

LEA Met

State

Target?

YES

NO

YES

YES

YES

Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported

Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported

Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level data are not reported

LYFORD CISD

State

Rate

66%

District

State

Target

≥ 68%

No	2459

2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ls, residential	≤ 1%	1%
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> 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%
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate scl residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥61%	61.8%
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary		
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	63.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the 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%

State

Met

Target?

NO

LEA

Rate

81.8%

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

Region County District No

01 245902

Due to small

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

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

District

≥ 72%

69%

NO

LYFORD CISD

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

14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

education or in some other postsecondary

one year of leaving high school.

secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

## About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

100%

99.7%

NO

conducted, within that timeframe

12: Percent of children referred by Part C

prior to age 3, who are found eligible for

Part B. and who have an IEP developed

and implemented by their third birthdays

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

YES

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C 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/.

20 Region County District No 007904

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

LYTLE 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	91.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	8.3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.5%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.5%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> 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	070	076	163			ES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

007904

20

District

LYTLE ISD

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